

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 24th November 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half-past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

**I.—CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF
SRI KUMARASAMY RAJA BAHADUR, RAJA OF KARVETNAGAR.**

MR. SPEAKER:—“ It is my painful duty to inform the House of the death of Sri Kumarasamy Raja Bahadur, Raja of Karvetnagar, Member representing the Puttur constituency, on 8th November 1952 at 5-30 a.m.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, before we proceed to transact any further business, I have a sad duty to perform. Within a short time we have lost another Member of this House. As hon. Members are aware, the late Sri Kumarasamy Raja Bahadur, Raja of Karvetnagar, who represented the Puttur constituency, passed away recently. The House might remember that it was on the 3rd November the Government Chief Whip moved a motion that the late Member may be given leave for one month because of his ill-health and the House was pleased to grant him the leave asked for. But unfortunately he died soon after.

“ The late Member belonged to a very ancient family of zamindars and I understand that Karvetnagar was one of the biggest zamindaris in our State. He was aged only 47 at the time of his death. It is my duty to move a formal Resolution of Condolence. I move—

‘ That this House place on record its deep sense of sorrow at the demise of Sri Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur, Rajah of Karvetnagar, late Member for Puttur, and conveys its deep sense of sympathy to the members of his bereaved family ’.

“ I am sure the whole House will associate itself with the resolution.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is my painful duty to associate myself and Members on this side of the House with the sentiments expressed in the Resolution of Condolence that has been moved by the Hon. the Leader of the House. I was away from here for some time and I did not expect that the first time I come here after my absence, we shall have to meet under the shadow of death. I came to know the Raja of Karvetnagar just after the elections and during the short period that I happened to know him I found that he was an extremely amiable person who, despite the fact of his being a zamindar, had the interest of his

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [24th November 1952]

ryots, the interests of the common people at heart. We did not have much opportunity to work with him. We worked with him for about two or three months. None the less I am sure every one of us feels that the House has lost a valuable Member. I associate myself again with the sentiments expressed by the Hon. the Leader of the House and support the Resolution."

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the absence of the Raja of Karvetnagar from this House is really felt by every Member here. To the people of the Puttur constituency which he represented, it is nothing but sorrow. They can never forget him. He is perhaps the only Member who did not spend any money on his election. People there contributed in thousands for his election expenses. It is not merely the votes that he won, but he won the hearts of the people there. Chittoor district has really lost a champion of the people. Though he was not a Member of any local body formerly and this is the first time he represented his people in this House, he was boiling with real zeal to serve his people. But we have lost him. We are sorry. The Chittoor district is really sorry for the loss of the Raja of Karvetnagar. Myself and Members of my Party wholeheartedly join the Hon. the Leader of the House in extending our condolence to the Members of the bereaved family, and really to the people of his constituency."

* SRI P. V. R. GAJAPATHI RAJU :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the Praja-Socialist Party I would like to express our deep sense of sorrow at the untimely death of the Raja of Karvetnagar. Coming myself from a zamindari family, I am well aware of this ancient house. I did not know the Rajahsaheb till we met here and got together and discussed politics. His knowledge of men and things and his sterling qualities and character were apparent. It is indeed sad that colleagues of ours leave us, but that is, I suppose, part of life. As such I hope that whatever there may be for him in another world, if there is such a world, he will be able to achieve all peace that is possible there. I join again the Hon. Leader of the House in sending our condolences to the members of the bereaved family."

10-40
a.m.

* SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Leader of the House correctly observed that Death has called on us again and that too within a short period, and this time the victim has been the Raja of Karvetnagar, a member belonging to the independent group of members of this Assembly. The Raja of Karvetnagar, though born a Raja, lived the life of a peasant. He had strong likes and dislikes and he was never afraid to speak out his convictions. Equally so, he was never slow to admit his faults. To his kith and kin, through this Resolution, we send our sincerest sorrow and deep sympathy, while at the same time we shall appeal to Death never to look upon this House again."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the Hon. the Leader of the House, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and other leaders. The Raja of Karvetnagar belonged to the Suryavamsa Kshatriya dynasty. I was told the

24th November 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

late Raja was the 105th in the line of Rajas. His ancestors ruled over Narayanavaram, Pallipattu and Tiruttani. He was a trustee of numerous temples and he had endowed large sums of money to various charitable institutions. The Resolution reads as follows :—

‘This House places on record its deep sense of sorrow at the demise of Sri Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur (Raja of Karvetnagar), late member for Puttur and conveys its deep sense of sympathy to the members of his bereaved family.’

“By way of passing this Resolution, I request the House to stand for two minutes.”

The Resolution was passed *nem. con.*, all the Members standing in silence for two minutes.

MR. SPEAKER :—“As a mark of respect to the late Member, I now adjourn the House for 10 minutes. The House will meet again at 10-55 a.m.”

[The House adjourned for 10 minutes and then reassembled with Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

II.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Calingapatnam Port.

*109^a Q.—SRI L. LAKSHMANA DAS: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state whether there is any proposal to improve and re-open Calingapatnam Port in Srikakulam district?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“The port has not been closed. The question of reopening it does not, therefore, arise. There are no proposals at present for improving the port.”

SRI L. LAKSHMANA DAS :—“Is there any proposal before the Government to connect the port with the railway station at Amadalavalasa?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member may put a separate question.”

Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill.

* 110 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether any memorandum was received by the Government from a deputation on behalf of the Madras State Inam Ryots' Associations Conference held in Madras on 23rd August 1952 requesting the Government to drop the present Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill and to bring in, in its stead an amendment of the Estates Land Act so as to cover all

[24th November 1952]

categories of inams despite the existence of more than one grant and to afford protection to the tenancy rights of the ryots in the State; and

(b) if so, the action taken so far?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—

“(a) Yes, Sir, a memorandum was received.

“(b) It is under consideration.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ May I know how much time the Government would take for considering the resolution of the inam ryots? Will the Government finish their consideration at least before the end of the present session? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The Government would take only a reasonable time, Sir. I cannot exactly say whether the Government would finish their consideration of the resolution before the end of the present session or the beginning of the next session.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ మద్రాస్ ఎస్టేట్స్ ల్యాండ్ ఆమెండ్ మెంట్ బిల్లును గవర్నమెంటువారు పదలుకోవ్వ లేదా? గవర్నమెంట్ దాన్ని drop చేసిందా లేక pursue చేస్తుందా? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ It is not intended to proceed with the Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill in the present form.”

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN :—“ Sir, the previous Ministry assured the previous Legislature that it would bring forward a legislation abolishing all inams in the State. May I know what is the attitude of the present Ministry to this question? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The present question deals with some representation by the Inam Ryots' Association.”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The matter is under consideration, Sir.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ May I know what the Hon. Minister means by the term ‘reasonable time’? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ As the word ‘reasonable’ is generally understood, Sir.”

Establishment of a regulated market for groundnuts.

11 a.m. * 111 Q.—SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR (on behalf of Sri K. Aranganathan) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state the action taken by the State Government to establish the market for groundnuts in North Arcot district and Salem district under the Madras Commercial Crops Markets Act?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ The Director of Agriculture submitted proposals in June 1951, for the establishment of regulated markets under the Madras Commercial Crops Markets Act, 1933, for cotton and groundnut

24th November 1952]

in Salem district and for groundnut in North Arcot district. After examining the proposals, it was decided that a regulated market should be established only in North Arcot district in respect of groundnut. The Government have accordingly issued a notification declaring the whole of the area situated within the limits of North Arcot district a notified area under the Madras Commercial Crops Markets Act, 1933, in respect of groundnut.

“Proposals called for from the Director of Agriculture for the constitution of a Market Committee for the notified area and for the establishment of regulated markets in it are awaited.”

SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR:—“Will the Government appoint a Committee for regulating trade in groundnut in the area comprising the three districts of Salem, North Arcot and South Arcot, on the lines of the South Arcot Groundnut Market Committee?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—“Notice, Sir.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—“Are there any commercial crops worth the name in Chingleput district, and if so, will the Government constitute a Committee to go into the question of bringing them under the Madras Commercial Crops Markets Act?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—“Notice, Sir.”

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN:—“What are the reasons for not constituting such a Committee for Salem district?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—“The Co-operative Marketing Societies in Salem district objected to the formation of a Commercial Crops Market Committee. The Registrar of Co-operative Societies also stated that the Marketing Societies in Salem district are working satisfactorily. A Commercial Crops Market Committee was not therefore organized there.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ఈ సంవత్సరం వేరుశనగధర పడిపోయినందు వల్ల రైతులకు చాలా నష్టము సంభవించినది. రైతుల స్థితిగతులు తారుమారుగాకుండు దుకుగాను వేరుశనగధరను ఒక స్థాయిని నిలబెట్టుటకు (అదుపులా పెట్టుటకు) ప్రయత్నం పూనుకుంటుందా?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—“A separate question might be asked, Sir.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—“Will the Government consider the formation of such a Committee in other districts where the people ask for it?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—“Wherever the growers ask for it, the question will be taken up, Sir.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“In view of the fact that Salem is one of the major groundnut producing districts in the State,

[24th November 1952]

will the Government be pleased to place on the table of the House the reports of the Agricultural Officer and the Co-operative department, for and against the establishment of Market Committee? "

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" It will be considered, Sir."

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI :—" ఎక్కడెక్కడైతే వేరుశనగ ముఖ్యమైన వంటకం, అక్కడల్లా marketing facilities కలగజేయటానికి ప్రయత్నం పూనుకుంటుందా ? "

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" Wherever cultivators of groundnut ask for it, the matter will be taken up, Sir."

Reservation of posts under the separation scheme.

* 112 Q.—SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR (on behalf of Sri K. Aranganathan) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Scheme for Separation of Judiciary from the Executive provides for the reservation of 40 per cent of the posts of Sub-Magistrates for the staff of the Revenue Department; and

(b) if so, whether it has been properly adhered to?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" (a) No proportion of vacancies of Sub-Magistrates has been specifically reserved to be filled up by the staff of the Revenue Department. But there is a provision in the scheme of separation for the initial recruitment of Sub-Magistrates that where suitable members of the Madras Revenue Sub-ordinate Service possessing legal qualifications are available, they will be eligible for such recruitment. The appointing authority is the High Court.

" (b) Does not arise.

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" On a point of information, Sir. The notice paper says that the Hon. the Chief Minister has got to answer this question, but the Hon. the Minister for Law has answered it."

MR. SPEAKER :—" It is a printer's mistake in the notice paper."

Subsistence loans to the beedi workers.

* 113 Q.—SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware that the awards delivered two years ago by the Industrial Tribunals regarding the beedi workers at Kalahasti, Chittoor and Puttur have not yet been implemented by the respective managements;

24th November 1952]

(b) what action the Government propose to take in the matter; and

(c) whether the Government propose to grant unemployment doles, or subsistence loans to the beedi workers who are thrown out of employment in the famine affected areas like Rayalaseema?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) & (b) The information received by the Government is that the awards have been implemented by the managements.

“(c) There is no proposal under the consideration of the Government.”

DR. K. B. MENON :—Are the Government aware that what has happened in the case of beedi workers is not an exception but a rule, and are the Government taking any measures to correct it?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“Sir, the question now asked is about five specific instances. If the hon. Member will give me some other cases, information will be given, Sir.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“రాయలసీమలోను, ముఖ్యంగా చిత్తూరు జిల్లాలోనుగల బీడి ఫ్యాక్టరీలలో పనిచేసే కార్మికులు ఆ నేతమంది ఇప్పుడు నిరుద్యోగులైనారు. వ్రాంచి శ్రామికులందరినీ పెట్టి కార్మికులను తిని విస్తున్నారు. వారి పరిస్థితులను, సమస్యలను తెలుసుకొనునందుకై ప్రభుత్వం ఒక కమిటీని వేస్తుందా?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“The Government are at the present moment trying to see how best this difference can be settled. We have called for a meeting of the beedi factory proprietors; we have called for a meeting of the leaders of labour unions; we have called for a meeting of the branch managers and we shall do our best to see that all these differences are amicably settled.”

(b) SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“Sir, the Hon. Minister has not answered clause (c) of the question, whether the Government propose to grant unemployment doles, or subsistence loans to the beedi workers who are thrown out of employment in the famine affected areas like Rayalaseema?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“Sir, I have answered that question. There is no proposal at the present moment under the consideration of the Government to grant unemployment doles or subsistence loans to the beedi workers who have been thrown out of employment.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“బీడి ఫ్యాక్టరీ యజమానుల, కార్మికుల ప్రతినిధులను ఒకచోట సమావేశపరచి సంగతినిపులస్తూ వివాదవిషయాలను పరిష్కరించుటకు ప్రభుత్వం ప్రయత్నం చేస్తున్నదని మంత్రిగారు తెలిపిచ్చాడు. త్వరగా యీ సమస్యను పరిష్కరించగలమని హామీయిస్తారా? కార్మికులకు న్యాయం జరుగునట్లు చూస్తారా?”

[24th November 1952]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“The hon. Member will realize how difficult it is to bring negotiations to a successful termination. I hope it will be as early as possible.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ఈ ట్రిబ్యూనల్స్ ఇచ్చిన లీర్నల్స్ మేనేజిమెంటులవారు అమలు జరుపుకులేదని మేము ఖచ్చితంగా చెప్పగలము. కాని తమకు అందిన సమాచారం అది కాదని మంత్రిగారు చెబుతున్నారు. ఫాక్టరీ యజమానులు తమ వ్యాపార సంస్థలను వేర్వేరు ప్రాంతాలుగా విభజించి Tribunal యొక్క అవార్డులు నిరుపయోగపరుచుకుని ఎన్నో కుతంత్రాలు వస్తుతున్నారు. ఈ విషయమై యదార్థ శరిశీతులను తెలుసుకొనుటకు, అవార్డులను సరకుంగా అమలు జరుపుటకు, ఆయా ప్రాంతములవారగు శాసనసభ్యులతో ఒక కమిటీని నిర్వహించే విచారణచేయిస్తారా ?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“Sir, I am sorry to say that my information is different. I have been told that in March 1950, the management of Shaik Ahamed Beedi Factory implemented the awards of the Industrial Tribunals and that in July 1950, the managements of four other factories also implemented the awards of the Industrial Tribunals. If the hon. Member will give me information and facts to prove that this information is wrong, I will certainly take action in the matter.”

Representations regarding commutation rates of rent.

* 114 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether a representation addressed to the Chief Minister, dated 20th August 1952, from Sri V. Narayanamurthi of Palakonda, Srikakulam district, was received by the Government complaining about the unfairness of commutation rates of rent; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“(a) Yes. The representation was that the rent fixed as the melwaram share due to him in accordance with the provisions of the Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Second Amendment Act, 1951, was too meagre.

“(b) It was transferred to the Collector of Srikakulam for disposal.”

Experiments on Lignite Industry.

11-10 a.m. * 115 Q.—SRI M. MUNI REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) for the last how many years experiments on Lignite Industry are being carried out in Vadalur taluk, South Arcot district and with what results; and

(b) the total cost incurred in this behalf till the end of August 1952?

24th November 1952]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) Lignite investigation is being carried on in and around Neyveli in Vriddhachalam taluk, South Arcot district, for the last ten years. The investigation has revealed the existence of about 2,000 million tons of lignite in an area of about 100 square miles at a depth of 175 feet from ground level. The lignite deposits are sandwiched between two layers of water bearing beds. The extraction of bulk samples of lignite from a shaft in September 1951 has shown that the difficult underground conditions can be successfully overcome. The underground conditions have however to be studied in greater detail before launching on large scale mining operations. A pilot quarrying scheme estimated to cost Rs. 79 lakhs has therefore been prepared to ascertain the actual underground conditions that may be experienced in large scale mining. The Government of India have agreed to lend some items of essential machinery required for the execution of the project. The Government propose to proceed with the scheme on receipt of the machinery from the Government of India. Tests carried out on the samples of lignite have revealed that the mineral is of good quality, capable of great industrial potentialities.

“(b) The total cost incurred by Government on the Lignite Project up to the end of August 1952 is 19.15 lakhs.”

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—“Some time back we understood from the newspapers that there was a lot of percolation of water causing difficulties for the working of the scheme. What is the situation to-day?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“We are hoping that we have discovered a method by which this difficulty can be removed; but to give a definite and concrete answer, the pilot scheme must be put into execution.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“Are the Government aware of the fact that the lignite expert who is in the area and who comes from the north, due to some misunderstanding with the villagers, is digging holes before the houses of villagers and is thus causing great difficulty to the villagers there?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member may put a separate question.”

SRI M. MUNI REDDI :—“How many years will it take for the completion of the experiments, and may I know whether it will be a profitable concern?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“The pilot scheme may take a couple of years to work, and if it does work, it will not only be a profitable scheme, but a very very profitable scheme.”

[24th November 1952]

Non-caste Hindus as Executive Officers of Hindu temples.

* 116 Q.—SRI A. APPU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments be pleased to state—

(a) how many non-caste Hindus have been appointed as Executive Officers of Hindu temples in Malabar taken over by the Board; and

(b) whether there is any rule that only caste Hindus can be appointed as employees in temples in Malabar?

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“(a) & (b) None.”

SRI A. APPU :—“Will the Government be pleased to issue instructions to the Endowments Board to appoint non-caste Hindus also as executive officers if suitable candidates apply for the post? In fact, there is not even a non-caste Hindu peon now; if a non-caste Hindu applies, the application is rejected summarily.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member should not make a speech.”

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“The draft rules relating to appointment of executive officers have been published for general information, and they are awaiting confirmation. Under these rules, the appointing authorities will be the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioners, Assistant Commissioners and Area Committees. No provision has been made in the draft rules for the reservation of any post for members of any particular community.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“Is it a fact that the Government are contemplating to abolish all the advisory committees regarding temple management in the districts?”

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“No, Sir.”

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN :—“May I know, Sir, whether the Government still follow this distinction of caste-Hindus and non-caste Hindus?”

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“No, Sir.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“దేవస్థానాలకు సంబంధించిన వివిధ సంస్థలలో హరిజనులను నియమించుటలేదని మాకు తెలుసు కాని మంత్రిగారు అది సరికాదంటున్నారు. దేముడే హరిజనులకు స్థానమివ్వవద్దనుచున్నాడా అని ప్రశ్నిస్తున్నాను?”

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“There are trustees of temples who are Harijans. Members of the Harijan community are also members of Area Committees in the various districts.”

24th November 1952]

Grant of loan to "Kumar Industries," Palghat.

* 117 Q.—SRI R. KRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) the amount of financial assistance granted to "Kumar Industries," Parli, Palghat, Malabar, by the Government;

(b) what the running capital of the company is;

(c) on what basis the grant was given;

(d) whether the Government have received any interest on the grant; and

(e) whether the Government have got any voice in the management of the company?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) Messrs. Kumar Industries, Edathara, were granted a loan of rupees one lakh under the provisions of the State Aid to Industries Act.

“(b) The running capital of the company as on 31st March 1952 was Rs. 1,71,000.

“(c) The loan was granted to the company on the basis of the security valued at Rs. 2,97,647.

“(d) The Government have so far received a sum of Rs. 9,713 as interest on the loan.

“(e) No, Sir.”

SRI R. KRISHNAN :—“May I know, Sir, whether any complaint has come to the notice of the Government regarding the labour dispute now continuing in the Kumar Industries? If so, what are the reasons for the dispute, how many labourers have been retrenched; and have the Government taken any steps to get them reinstated?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member may give notice of a separate question.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ఈ పరిశ్రమ వివిధంగా పనిచేస్తున్నా దో మంత్రిగారు చెప్పగలరా?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“The Government do not participate in or control the management or the affairs of the company. The assets of the company are hypothecated to the Government; they are periodically inspected in order to ensure that they are intact and are maintained in sound condition.”

DR. K. B. MENON :—“Is the insistence on the payment of interest the only demand which Government make when they make the grants, or do the Government have any general control during the period of these grants?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“I stated in my reply that the Government have received Rs. 9,000 and odd as interest, because that was the question asked. But the company has so far paid Rs. 12,950 in two instalments which fell

[24th November 1952]

due on the 1st February 1951 and 1st February 1952. As I said, our inspectors are only concerned with seeing that the Government money is secured. This is a private concern which works on its own responsibility."

SRI T. VIŚWANATHAM :—" May I know whether the Government have got any information as to whether this concern is working satisfactorily? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" I would like to have notice of the question, Sir."

*Construction of a bridge at Kanayangode Ferry,
North Malabar.*

* 118 Q.—SRI C. KUNHIRAMA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state whether the District Board of Malabar requested the Government for any subsidy for the construction of a bridge at Kanayangode Ferry, North Malabar, and if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" The Malabar District Board has not made any request to Government for a grant for the work."

SRI C. KUNHIRAMA KURUP :—" May I know if the Highways Department has any scheme under contemplation for the construction of the bridge? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member may put a separate question."

Recognition of associations of Government servants.

* 119 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is a Government Order laying down that no association of Government servants should be formed unless prior permission for the formation of the association is applied for and obtained;

(b) what are the conditions that an intended organization of Government servants should fulfil before permission for an association can be given; and

(c) whether any changes in the orders were effected after the Indian Constitution came into force, and if so, what they are?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" (a) & (b) There is no Government Order prohibiting the formation of any association, but the Government have prescribed certain conditions for the recognition of associations of Government employees. A copy of the Government Order^a containing the instructions is placed on the table of the House.

24th November 1952]

“(c) No changes were effected after the coming into force of the Constitution.”

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—“**8క్యూఎఫ్** లేకుండా ఎఫ్.సి.యూ.ఎఫ్.లను form చేసేవారిపై చర్యతీసుకోనుదరని బెదిరిస్తున్నారా? లేదా?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“The last portion of the question, I did not follow. What is sought to be done to these people? (An hon. Member: ‘Intimidation.’) Oh! It is hardly necessary to answer the question, because Government do not indulge in any intimidation.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Are the Government aware whether the officers are using any pressure to prevent these persons from joining these associations?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“No, Sir.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“In view of the fact that it is a fundamental question of trade union rights, and also the question of collective bargaining is involved in it, will the Government consider the desirability of removing any condition attached to the formation of trade unions and the recognition of trade unions of Government servants?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“Government employees come into possession of their offices on contract, express or implied, and Government are entitled to lay down these conditions according to the contract.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“If this premise is accepted, is the Hon. Minister aware that any employee in any industry or undertaking is also entering service under a contract, implied or otherwise, and other employers also will follow the Government and dictate their own conditions?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“No, Sir; I do not think that those who work in industries where trade unions are allowed and are working will be affected. This condition will not apply to those cases.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—“ఇటువంటి సంస్థలలో ప్రభుత్వ ఉన్న ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు, మంత్రిమంత్రి కలమేకాని వారి ఇబ్బందుల గురించి విన్నవించుకొంటే, పై ఆశీకారులు ఆటివారిపై disciplinary action తీసుకుంటున్నారనే విషయం ప్రభుత్వంవారికి తెలుసా? ఆటి సంస్థల్లో ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఎట్టి చర్య తీసుకుంటారు?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“There are definite rules as to the procedure to be followed by all Government servants who have any grievance; and if those rules are followed, there will be no question of any disciplinary action.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“May I know whether Govern- 11-20
ment servants are prevented from meeting Ministers when they a.m.
have to make any representations to them about their
grievances?”

[24th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Government servants of any particular category, grade or status who have a right of approaching Ministers directly can do so but others are not allowed to short-circuit and reach the Ministers without reference to those under whose discipline they must work."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"ప్రభుత్వం recognise చేయని సంఘాలలో సభ్యులుగా ఉన్న ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు తమ సమస్యలను మంత్రిలకు ఉన్నచిరుకొన రాదా? అవిధంగా విన్నవించుకొనినవాటిమీద ప్రభుత్వం చర్యతీసుకొన్నదా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"There should be no confusion between approaching Ministers by the Government servant individually and approach by the associations as such collectively, and approach by associations as such collectively has not been prevented by the Government."

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH:—"May I know whether associations recognized by the Government are at liberty to discuss politics and pass resolutions?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"A study of the rules will show that this is not allowed."

Fair price shops in Krishna district.

* 120 Q.—SRI V. RAMA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) how many fair price shops are newly opened in Krishna district after decontrol;

(b) what is the total offtake of rice from the ration shops—

(1) before decontrol and

(2) after decontrol; and

(c) how long the Government expect to supply rice through fair price shops at the present level of ration with the stocks that are held by the Government in the district?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—" (a) 430.

" (b) (1) 1,140 tons for two weeks ending 14th June 1952.

(2) 1,052 tons for two weeks ending 13th September 1952.

" (c) As matters stand at present the Government expect to supply rice through fair price shops till about the end of December 1952. The present scale of rice ration will continue until further orders."

SRI V. RAMA RAO:—"మట్టప్రాంతాలలో ఈ సంవత్సరం జొన్న వగైరా పంటలు పోయినందువల్ల ప్రజలకు ఆహార పానీయాలు సరిగా లభ్యమగుటలేదు. కాబట్టి ఆ ప్రాంతాలలో fair price shops ను ప్రభుత్వం ఏర్పాటుచేయకుండా చూస్తుందా?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Notice, Sir."

24th November 1952]

Representation by Srimathi K. Savithriamma of Augiripalli regarding alleged death of her husband.

* 121 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether a representation, dated 22nd August 1952, from Srimathi K. Savithriamma of Augiripalli, Krishna district, was received by the Government, complaining about the death of her husband during the Police enquiry on or about 12th August 1952 in respect of a theft case; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“(a) Yes.

“(b) Even prior to the receipt of the representation, dated 22nd August 1952, the Subdivisional Magistrate, Nuzvid, on receipt of a telegram on the 13th August, promptly conducted an enquiry into the matter and himself inspected the dead body before post-mortem examination. He examined 26 witnesses in connexion with this matter and gave his considered finding that Konduri Satyanarayana committed suicide by consuming acid and that his death was not due to any police lathi charge. The post-mortem examination supported the finding and indicated that death was due to the rupture of the stomach on account of sulphuric acid poisoning.

“As a magisterial enquiry was held, no further action in the matter is called for.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I know, Sir, where the post-mortem examination was conducted?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“The post-mortem examination was conducted by the Civil Assistant Surgeon at Gannavaram.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I know, Sir, whether the Government are aware that the man was dead before he was taken to Gannavaram. According to the information in my possession the man was first taken to Nuzvid where the doctor was not found, but the man subsequently died and there was no post-mortem examination as such? If there was a post-mortem examination, might I ask the Hon. the Chief Minister if he will place the post-mortem examination report on the table of the House?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“The hon. Member is referring to an incident on which I can throw little light at once. The Civil Assistant Surgeon, Nuzvid, who could have possibly given him medical assistance was not in Nuzvid as he was away at Bandar on court duty, and later the body was examined at Gannavaram after death. The question of his having been alive at some point does not relate to the post-mortem examination, I do not exactly understand what the hon. Member means.”

[24th November 1952]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ఈ చనిపోయిన వ్యక్తిని ఆ నాటి ఉదయం ఆరు గంటలకు పోలీసులు arrest చేశారు. మూడు గంటలవరకు చారుణంగా హింసించారు ; అప్పుడు వదలిపెట్టారు. తిరిగి ఐదు గంటలకు arrest చేశారు. ఆ తరువాతనే ఆ వ్యక్తి పోలీసువారి చేతులలో చనిపోయాడు; ఇవేకదా యదార్థమైన విషయాలు?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The allegation now made is that the incidents have not been correctly represented and that some other version is true. If the hon. Member will kindly give me that version, I shall have the details examined, but so far as I know, what I have said is correct.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I know, Sir, whether a panchayat was held at Nuzvid and the panchayatdars in the presence of the village magistrate recorded their finding that the man died due to heavy and dangerous blows? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The inquest that the hon. Member refers to was held, but that was before the magisterial enquiry. The widow of the deceased had told them during the enquiry that her husband had told her that he had been beaten by the Police, but it was after that that the magistrate held the enquiry, and the *post-mortem* and the chemical examination were held.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Question No. 122.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I should like to request you, Sir, to allow a half-hour debate upon the question.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ There are so many instances like this, Sir.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I would like to submit to the House, Sir, that the verdict of the village panchayatdars should not disturb our minds when a magisterial enquiry with an examination of 26 witnesses was held subsequently and the *post-mortem* examination was held and a finding was arrived at, and subsequently the viscera and other things were sent for chemical examination and all these things confirmed the finding. I submit we must be content with that. In an old case like this, a debate in the House will not throw any further light on the question. It may be true that the villagers thought that he had been beaten to death, but as a matter of fact the action of sulphuric acid on the stomach is not a thing that can be hidden or covered or concocted. So, we must be content with the finding of the magistrate and the *post-mortem* examination. The Government are not prepared to submit to a half-hour debate in the House on this subject.”

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—**“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I should submit to you that the facts given by the Hon. the Chief Minister are not at all convincing. We would certainly like to elicit some more information, but since you have passed on to the next question, I am not able to put any further supplementary questions.

24th November 1952]

It would certainly serve the purpose of justice if you are pleased to allow a half-hour debate on this question, because there are more things which are still unanswered and there are so many matters of doubt that have to be cleared. There is no use the Hon. the Chief Minister saying that no purpose will be served by having a debate in this House after the magistrate has given a finding. I submit to you, Sir, every purpose will be served if at least one case is thoroughly examined on the floor of the House. Otherwise, it would serve as a bad encouragement to the Police."

MR. SPEAKER :—" As for the request of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I must remind him that I have given enough time for this question. In case the hon. Member wants to have further information, I suggest to him to give notice of a separate question. It is not possible to have a half-hour debate, as we are going to rise at six o'clock."

Distribution of yarn to fishermen.

* 122 Q.—SRI PRAGADA KOTIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state the procedure being adopted by the Government in the matter of supplying yarn for making nets by the fishermen?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" The Fisheries Department procures yarn to meet the requirements of fishermen in accordance with the monthly allotments made by the Director of Controlled Commodities from specified mills. These allotments are based on the monthly indents sent by the Fisheries Department. From the procured stocks, supplies are made to fishermen co-operative societies who are permitted to distribute the yarn to members as well as non-members. The Fisheries Department has also opened 30 depots at suitable centres for direct distribution of yarn to individual fishermen who are not members of co-operative societies.

" The distribution of yarn to fishermen is made both for mending old nets and for making new nets. Yarn supplied for the former purpose is sold at a subsidized rate in order to induce fishermen to bring back to use the nets in disrepair."

SRI PRAGADA KOTIAH :—" May I know, Sir, the rate of subsidy given for the yarn last year and the rate given this year? "

11-30
a.m.

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" Last year it was 25 per cent. This year it has been reduced to 6½ per cent, but the Director of Fisheries has made proposals to restore the old subsidy in view of the fact that the price of yarn has fallen down."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Question Hour is over. The answers to the remaining starred questions will be printed in the proceedings."

[24th November 1952]

Armed Police camps.

* 123 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) the number of Armed Police camps working in Madras State and the number of such camps in the Circars and the places where they are located;

(b) the number of villages raided by the Companies of Armed Police after 1st April 1952, to date; and

(c) the number of persons taken into Police camps for confinement, the number released and the number remaining in such camps from 1st April 1952 to 1st September 1952?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“(a) In 1950–51 in order to combat the terrorist activities of subversive elements, Special Armed Police and Malabar Special Police detachments were posted at a few centres in Krishna, Guntur and Kurnool districts and officers on special duty used these centres for discussion with and interrogation of, persons who volunteered to give information about the terrorist dalams operating in those districts. As the Law and Order situation improved, the need for such interrogation diminished and it has now altogether ceased. Besides, a few armed police detachments were also stationed in certain places in Tiruvur, Gudivada and Gannavaram taluks in the Krishna district with the object of creating a sense of security and for maintaining law and order. Apart from the above, there are no Armed Police Camps at present in the State.

“(b) No villages were raided by the Armed Police but in connexion with the riot which occurred at Elugupadu in Krishna district on 26th June 1952, a section of the Armed Police was made use of to assist the local Police in arresting the accused, who were hiding in neighbouring villages.

“(c) No persons were confined in Police camps, even if the places referred to in the answer to clause (a) are termed as such, but persons who volunteered to give information about the terrorist dalams were directed to the Special duty officers who used to camp at the places where the Malabar Special Police and the Special Armed Police detachments were stationed. The number of persons who interviewed the officers cannot be estimated as no records of these were maintained in the interests of secrecy and protection of those who volunteered to assist the Government. After enquiry the persons concerned returned to their villages to pursue their normal avocations.”

Reduction in the price of yarn.

* 125 Q.—SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state the action taken by the Government to get a reduction in the prices of yarn in proportion to the fall in prices of cotton?

24th November 1952]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ This Government have already addressed the Government of India on the subject and the matter is under consideration of that Government.”

[“ Starred questions Nos. 124 and 126 postponed for answer on 25th November 1952.”]

Fair price rice shop for Government servants in Krishna district.

* 127 Q.—SRI G. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state whether the non-gazetted officers of Krishna district requested the Collector of Krishna to open a fair price rice shop for them and if so, whether it was sanctioned and if not, why not?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Yes. On a representation of the President of the Non-Gazetted Officers' Association, Masulipatnam, a fair price shop was granted to the Association exclusively to cater to the needs of the Non-Gazetted Officers in Masulipatnam town. As the President of the Association subsequently reported that the Association was not in a position to run the shop for want of funds, orders were issued, transferring the shop to the Masulipatnam Consumers Co-operative Society, on the suggestion of the President of the Association.”

Government Hospital, Nuzvid.

* 128 Q.—SRI M. R. APPA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is a proposal to construct Taluk Headquarters' Hospital in Nuzvid; and

(b) if so, at what stage is it?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ (a) & (b) No; but the following improvements to the existing Government hospital have been sanctioned in April 1950 at an estimated cost of Rs. 1,93,338 :—

(i) Acquisition of site.

(ii) Construction of an Operation Theatre.

(iii) Maternity ward.

(iv) Two general wards of 6 beds each.

“ The Government have no information about the progress of these works.”

[24th November 1952]

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS.*Number of boys and girls studying in educational institutions.*

16 Q.—SRI M. MUNI REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) the number of (1) boys and (2) girls studying in educational institutions including colleges in this State;

(b) the number of boys and girls receiving education from rural and urban parts; and

(c) the number of hostels attached to

(1) high schools;

(2) colleges; and

(3) the number of students admitted to such hostels?

A.—(a) Boys—3,253,995.

Girls—1,617,458.

(b) *Rural parts*—

Strength in males' institutions—3,094,504.

Strength in females' institutions—4,836.

Urban parts—

Strength in males' institutions—1,677,226.

Strength in females' institutions—94,837.

Separate particulars in respect of boys and girls receiving education from rural and urban parts are not readily available.

(c) The number of hostels—

(1) High schools—308.

(2) Colleges—99.

(3) The number of students admitted to hostels attached to high schools and colleges are 25,669 and 16,763, respectively.

Assessment on wet and dry lands in Malabar district.

17 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the average market price of commodities published by the Collector of Malabar under section 51 (1) of Malabar Tenancy Act from 1930 to 1950 in each year; and

(b) the assessment on wet and dry lands in Malabar districts?

A.—(a) The particulars required by the hon. Member are not available. Nor is it possible to collect them as it will involve much time and labour.

24th November 1952]

(b) The assessment for fasli 1361 on wet and dry lands in the Malabar district is as follows :—

	RS.
Wet	23,59,397
Dry	3,43,£99

Investigation of hydro-electric sites in the State.

18 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether hydro-electric charts prepared for (1) Gundlakamma river, (2) Manneru river, (3) Kalangi river, (4) Swarnamukhi river alluded to on pages 18–19 of the Administration Report of the Electricity department for 1949–50 have been followed by sanction for construction of reservoirs and hydro-electric stations and if so at what stage each scheme now stands; and

(b) of the 64 hydro-electric schemes alluded to on pages 18–19 of the Report the names of schemes (1) taken up for construction, (2) in course of construction and (3) completed and energy generated?

A.—(a) & (b) A statement^a is laid on the table of the House.

Water-rates under different projects.

19 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the water rate per acre for first crop;

(b) the water rate per acre for second crop; and

(c) the water rate per acre for land irregularly irrigated, under each of the following :—

(1) Godavari Irrigation system;

(2) Krishna Irrigation system;

(3) Pennar Irrigation system;

(4) Cauvery Irrigation system; and

(5) the Minor Irrigation tank system?

A.—(a) & (b) The water rate on dry lands depends upon the nature of the crop grown, that is, wet or dry, the nature of irrigation, i.e., systematic or occasional, by flow or by lift, the order of the crop grown, i.e., first crop, second crop or third crop and the class of irrigation source from which water is taken. The standard rates of water-cess vary generally from Rs. 1–8–0 to Rs. 4 per acre for a first crop and annas 12 to Rs. 3 per acre for a second crop. The rates under

[24th November 1952]

the different projects are however higher and vary and the second crop rate is generally half of the first crop rate.

For a second wet crop raised on a single crop wet land, the extra charge payable is ordinarily half the assessment.

- (c) For irregular irrigation enhanced water-cess is levied and the levy varies from two rates to twenty rates of the normal water-cess chargeable under the system, depending upon the fact whether the irregular irrigation resorted to was the first, second, third or the fourth and subsequent occasion.

Distribution of milk in maternity and child-welfare centres.

20 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether free milk is distributed through maternity and child-welfare centres to (1) expectant mothers, (2) nursing mothers and (3) infants, and if so, how many such centres there are in the State and at what places; and what is the average number of each category daily receiving free milk; and

(b) what were the number of maternity and child-welfare centres on 1st April 1952 in famished areas of the State and what is the number as on 1st September 1952?

A.—(a) Yes. Cow's milk and milk constituted from skimmed milk powder are distributed free through maternity and child-welfare centres of the State to (1) expectant mothers, (2) nursing mothers and (3) infants. A statement ^a showing the number of centres which distributed cow's milk during 1951–52, the places where those centres are run and the average number of expectant mothers, nursing mothers and infants or children who received the free supply of milk is furnished below.

The UNICEF donated to this State a quantity of 1,412,500 lb. of skimmed milk powder and this was distributed during the period from July 1951 to March 1952 through various agencies including the maternity and child-welfare centres.

(b) A statement ^a is furnished.

Thermal station at Nellore.

21 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) when the thermal station for Nellore began generating power;

(b) the number of maximum units of electricity the power plant at Nellore is designed to supply per day;

24th November 1952]

(c) the average number of units that the thermal station is supplying per day to (1) consumers and (2) agriculturists for irrigation purposes; and

(d) the rate per unit charged for consumers for lights in (1) Nellore town, (2) Gudur town and (3) Kovur Panchayat area?

A.—(a) to (d) A statement ^a is laid on the table of the House.

Pay and allowances drawn by Ministers.

22 Q.—SRI D. KRISHNAMURTY GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state what are the actual amount of monthly salaries and allowances disbursed to each of the Hon. Ministers including the Hon. the Chief Minister?

A.—A statement ^b showing the monthly salaries and allowances drawn by each of the Ministers including the Chief Minister is laid on the table of the House.

Number of estates taken over by the Government.

23 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) when and how many Estates have been so far taken over by the Government in the State, districtwar;

(b) the names of Estates and Inam Estates which have not been yet taken over;

(c) the reasons for not taking them over yet; and

(d) when they are proposed to be taken over by the Government?

A.—(a) A statement ^c giving the information is appended.

(b) The Government have not got the information.

(c) The reason for which some estates have not yet been taken over is that appeals have been filed before the Tribunals and the appeals have not yet been disposed of or that the estates are covered by stay orders of the High Court.

(d) They will be taken over after the appeals have been disposed of or after the stay orders have been vacated, as the case may be.

Number of Inam villages in the State.

24 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to place on the table a detailed statement regarding—

(a) the names of inam villages which are not estates even after the passing of the Madras Estates Land (Amendment) Act of 1936; and

^a Printed as Appendix IV on pages 505–506 infra.

^b Printed as Appendix V on page 506 infra.

^c Printed as Appendix VI on pages 507–510 infra.

[24th November 1952]

(b) the names of villages which are affected by virtue of recent judicial decisions—

- (1) by not being grant of whole inam village;
- (2) by being a grant of only a hamlet or kandriga;
- (3) by reason of more grants than one; and
- (4) by reason of being carved out of an original village?

A.—(a) There are about 7,400 inam villages in the whole of the State. In the course of their enquiry under section 9 of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, the Settlement Officers have found that, out of these 7,400 inam villages, 680 are not estates under section 3 (2) (d) of the Madras Estates Land Act. The Government do not have the names of these villages.

(b) A statement ^a is appended.

Extent of cultivated land in the Kasargode taluk.

25 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA NAMBIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the total extent of cultivated land in the Kasargode taluk of South Kanara district;

- (b) the total extent of cultivable waste land;
- (c) the total extent of non-cultivable waste land;
- (d) the total extent of Government forest;
- (e) the total extent of non-Government forests;
- (f) the total extent of lands cultivated with coconuts;
- (g) the total extent cultivated with arecanuts; and
- (h) the total extent cultivated with pepper?

A.—(a) 586,373 acres.

(b) 213,284 acres.

(c) 328,105 acres.

(d) 514,789 acres.

(e) 17,448 acres.

(f) 53,929 acres.

(g) 23,241 acres.

(h) 12,359 acres.

Substitution of sangathi in the place of gruel.

26 Q.—SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether there is a proposal to substitute sangathi (solid form of food) in the place of gruel at gruel centres in Rayalaseema after receiving Soviet grain?

A.—The answer is in the negative.

24th November 1952]

Improvements to Bukkapatnam tank, Anantapur district.

27 Q.—SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal to improve the water-supply resources of Bukkapatnam tank in Anantapur district; and

(b) whether there is any agreement between Mysore Government and Madras Government with regard to the supply of water to this tank?

A.—(a) Proposals for raising the full-tank level of the Bukkapatnam tank in Anantapur district have been considered and dropped, since the surplusing history of the tank is not encouraging.

(b) No, except the general agreement of 1892. According to this agreement, Mysore cannot take up any new irrigation scheme on the main Chitravathi river or in the whole basin to the north of the Chelur-Bangana-halli road without the prior consent of this Government.

The Pincha Project in Cuddapah district.

28 Q.—SRI Y. AUDINARAYANA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) at what stage the investigation of the Pincha Project on the river Pincha near the village Mudumpadu in Rayachoti taluk is;

(b) what time it will take to finish the investigation;

(c) if the investigation has been finished what opinion the Engineers have given about the feasibility of constructing the project;

(d) what acreage will be served by this Pincha Project; and

(e) what cultivable acreage will be submerged by this project?

A.—(a) The field investigation is in progress.

(b) By the end of this year.

(c) Does not arise.

(d) Possibly 2,400 acres.

(e) Possibly about 833 acres.

Scales of pay of the medical officers of the former Pudukkottai State.

29 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) on what date the medical officers of the former Pudukkottai State Medical Service were absorbed into the corresponding Medical Service of Madras State;

[24th November 1952]

(b) from what date these absorbed officers were entitled to draw the Madras State scales of pay;

(c) to how many medical officers of the former Pudukkottai State Service, house rent is allowed; and

(d) to how many such rent is not allowed?

A.—(a) The medical officers of the former Pudukkottai State were absorbed in the Madras Medical Service from 1st January 1949.

(b) Their pay was fixed in the corresponding scale of pay admissible to medical officers in the Madras Medical Service from 1st January 1949 but were allowed to draw arrears of pay only from 1st September 1949.

(c) & (d) No house rent is allowed to any of them.

Sree Shaila Charities Trust, Kurumbranad.

30 Q.—JANAB K. MOIDU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Labour Officer, Malabar, has recommended to the Government to refer the industrial dispute in the Sree Shaila Charities Trust, Kurumbranad, for adjudication by an industrial tribunal; and what action has been taken in the matter?

A.—In July 1952, the Labour Officer, Kozhikode, sent reports to Government in respect of the dispute between the workers and the management of Shri Shaila Industrial and Spiritual Colony Charities, Katalur P.O., Malabar, stating that there was no case for adjudication and the Commissioner of Labour also agreed with him. The Government considered his report and decided that there was no case for adjudication. Both the parties have been informed accordingly.

Village vaidyas.

31 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) the number of village vaidyas trained up to date in the State;

(b) whether all the trainees were appointed by the Government or not; and

(c) what the individual payment to a village vaidya per month?

A.—(a) The number of village vaidyas trained up to April 1952—

(i) Number of candidates admitted to training (up to April 1952)—755.

(ii) Number of candidates declared as village vaidyas—704.

The result of 93 candidates admitted during April to October 1952 is awaited.

24th November 1952]

(b) The Government are not appointing the village vaidyas. They(?) are officially recognized as village vaidyas and they are given an honorarium by the panchayat board concerned if its finance permits.

(c) The amount paid to a village vaidya depends on the financial position of the panchayat board and this amount varies from Rs. 15 to Rs. 50 per mensem.

New bus permits granted in Tiruchirappalli district.

32 Q.—SRI P. RANGASAMI REDDIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) the names of persons to whom and the routes for which bus permits were issued during the years 1947 to 1952 in Tiruchirappalli district; and

(b) whether the Government have formulated any rules for issuing the bus permits or whether they are granted at the discretion of the respective Regional Transport Authorities?

A.—(a) A statement^a is annexed.

(b) The Government have not formulated any special rules for issuing the bus permits. The Regional Transport Authorities follow the procedure prescribed in the Motor Vehicles Act and the rules made thereunder.

Number of criminal appeals pending before the High Court.

33 Q.—SRI P. RANGASAMI REDDIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(a) the number of criminal appeals pending before the High Court on 1st April 1952, more than three months old, more than six months, more than one year and more than two years; and

(b) the number of appellants in jail during the pendency of their criminal appeals?

A.—(a) 82 (more than 3 months); 16 (more than 6 months); 7 (more than 1 year); and nil (more than 2 years).

(b) 34 (in criminal appeals pending for more than 3 months); 10 (in criminal appeals pending for more than 6 months); 3 (in criminal appeals pending for more than 1 year); and nil (in criminal appeals pending for more than 2 years).

Supply of electricity from Jog to South Kanara.

34 Q.—SRI T. ANANTHA PAI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) what progress has been made in the negotiations between the Government of Mysore and the Government of Madras for the supply of electricity from Jog to South Kanara; and

(b) when the agreement is likely to be signed?

[24th November 1952]

- A.—(a) & (b) Only the agreement for supply of Jog power to South Kanara remains to be concluded. The main point of difference between the Governments of Madras and Mysore regarding the draft of the clause relating to levy of surcharge on rates of supply is likely to be settled soon.

III.—MESSAGES FROM THE COUNCIL.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I have to announce to the House the following Messages, dated 17th November 1952, received from the Hon. Chairman, Madras Legislative Council :—

1. I transmit a copy of the Madras District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 13 of 1952), as agreed to by the Council without any amendment and signed by me.

2. I transmit a copy of the Madras Cotton Control Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 15 of 1952), as agreed to by the Council without any amendment and signed by me.

3. I transmit a copy of the Madras Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 14 of 1952), as agreed to by the Council without any amendment and signed by me.

4. I transmit a copy of the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 10 of 1952), as agreed to by the Council without any amendment and signed by me.

5. I transmit a copy of the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 8 of 1952), as agreed to by the Council without any amendment and signed by me.

6. I transmit a copy of the following motion passed to-day by the Madras Legislative Council concurring with the Madras Legislative Assembly in setting up a Joint Select Committee of both the Chambers to consider the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 12 of 1952) :—

‘ That this House concurs in setting up a Joint Select Committee of both the Houses consisting of 29 Members to consider the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (19 Members from the Assembly and 10 Members from the Council) and that the following Members of this House be selected to serve on such a Joint Select Committee :—

- 1 Sri C. Rajagopalachari (Chief Minister),
- 2 „ N. Ranga Reddi (Minister for Public Works),
- 3 „ S. Narasapaya,
- 4 Janab A. M. Allapichai,
- 5 Sri V. Bhashyam Ayyangar,
- 6 „ C. Marudavanam Pillai,
- 7 „ T. J. M. Wilson,
- 8 „ K. Bhashyam,
- 9 „ V. Gurunandan Rao,
- 10 „ K. Suryanarayana. ’ ”

24th November 1952]

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILLS.

(1) THE MADRAS ESSENTIAL ARTICLES CONTROL AND REQUISITIONING (TEMPORARY POWERS) AMENDMENT BILL, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill ^a, 1952, and move—

‘ That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.’

“ This is a very simple measure. The original Act has been in existence from 1946. That Act was re-enacted in 1949 as Madras Act XXIX of 1949 and it expires on the 31st December 1952. In order to ensure proper supply and distribution of essential articles, it is considered necessary that the provisions of this Act should be kept alive up to the 25th January 1955. The date is fixed with reference to the Central Act, the Essential Supplies (Temporary Powers) Act, 1946. The Central Act expires on the 25th January 1955 and so we want that our Act also should be in existence till 1955. That is why that date is fixed.

“ Sir, as far as this Bill is concerned, it is only supplementary to the Central Act. Very many essential articles come under the Central Act. In order to have powers with respect to certain other articles which are not contemplated under the Central Act, this Bill has been brought into existence and it is proposed to extend its life up to 1955. In asking for the extension of the life of this Act, we have taken this occasion to bring forward certain amendments so that there may not be any conflict between the Central Act in existence and our Act. The Central Act, the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act of 1951, in some respects, comes into conflict with the existing provisions of our Act. The object of our amendments is to remove all reference to production of essential articles because the entire production is governed by the Central Act, the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act of 1951. We are removing certain articles mentioned in the Schedule with reference to which we can pass orders as to its supply and distribution because those articles are already covered by the Central Act. Sir, with these words I move that this Bill may be taken into consideration immediately and passed.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The motion is—

‘ That the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.’ ”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ On a point of information, Sir. The original Act has not been supplied to the Members of this House. Whenever an amending Bill is brought forward, the original Act should be placed on the table of the House so that Members can understand in what connexion the amending Bill has been brought forward.”

^a Published in the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 17th November 1952.

[24th November 1952]

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ If the hon. Member would only refer to the annexure attached to the proposed Bill, he would find the existing provisions and the proposed amendments side by side.”

11-40
a.m.

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఈ Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning Amending Bill అనే దాన్ని యారోజున ప్రభుత్వంవారు తెచ్చారు. ఈ సవరణ బిల్లు ముఖ్యంగా కంట్రోల్స్‌కు సంబంధించియున్నది. ఇలాంటి సవరణను తెచ్చేటప్పుడు సభ్యులకు దీని విషయమై అలోచించి సభలో చర్చించుటకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు తగిన అవకాశము ఇవ్వాలి. అలాంటిది యేమి య జరుగలేదు. ఈ విషయములో నేను ఒక విషయము చెప్పదలచుకున్నాను. ఇదివరకు క్రిందటి బడ్జెటు సమావేశములో యీ మంత్రివర్గమువారు కంట్రోల్స్ అన్నియును తీసివారివేస్తామని ప్రకటించియున్నారు. కాని యిప్పుడు essential articles మీద కంట్రోల్స్ పెట్టుకొనున అంటున్నారు. అటువంటిప్పుడు అవసరమైన వస్తువులమీద కంట్రోల్స్ పెట్టుకొనునవెప్పుడూ ఇదివరకు అమలులో ఉన్నటువంటి బిల్లును మార్చాలని ప్రయత్నించుచూ ఉండడము అనేదిగా కన్పించుచున్నది. ఇదంతా తారీఖు మార్చవలెననే ఉద్దేశ్యముగా కనబడుచున్నది. అయితే యీ సందర్భములో ఒక విషయము చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ఆరోజున కంట్రోల్స్ తీసివేసేటప్పుడు ప్రజలయొక్క అభిప్రాయమును తెలుసుకోకుండానే తాత్కాలికంగా తీసివేశామని అన్నారు. యారోజున మరల కంట్రోల్స్ పెట్టేటప్పుడైనా కనీసం ప్రజలయొక్క అభిప్రాయము కనుగొనవలసియుంది. అలాంటి అవకాశాన్ని ప్రజలకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఇవ్వడములేదు. అంతేకాకుండా Sri C. V. K. Row గారు చెప్పినట్లు యీ సవరణ బిల్లు విషయములో సభ్యులకు అలోచనకే అవకాశంలేకుండా సభ్యులకు అందజేశారు. నిజానికి 22, 23 తేదీలలో యేము ఇక్కడికివచ్చాక యీ బిల్లు circulate చేశారు. మరురోజే యీ 24 వ తేదీన యీ బిల్లు వర్చకు వచ్చింది. అందువల్లనే యీ విషయములో అలోచనకే అవకాశములేకుండా పోయింది. అలాంటిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారికి యీ ప్రజలమీద సహకారభావమున్నట్లయితే, యీ బిల్లులో దీని పరిమితకాలము యింకను మూడుసంవత్సరాలకాలము పొడిగించడమనేది ప్రజలకు లాభదాయకమగునా లేదా అనే విషయము తెలుసుకొనేందుకు యీ సవరణ బిల్లును ప్రజాభిప్రాయానికి వదిలివేస్తే బాగుండునని కోరుతున్నాను. అట్లుచేయుకుండా రాష్ట్రములో ఏ ఏ ప్రాంతాలలో ఏ ఏ యిబ్బందులు ఉన్నాయో తెలుసుకోకుండా యీ బిల్లును తేవడం చాలా అన్యాయము. ప్రజల కష్టసుఖాలు, అభిప్రాయాలు ముందుగా ప్రభుత్వమువారు తేల్చుకోవాలి. ఈ కాల పరిమితి ప్రజలకు లాభమా నష్టమా అనేది పరీక్షించాలి. ఇటువంటిది యేమియు చేసినట్లు తోచదు. ఈ విషయములో ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క control policy యేమిటో అర్థము కావడంలేదు. ఈనాడు కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము అమలులోనికి తీసుకొనిరాబోయే Planning Commission వారి రిపోర్టును అమలులో పెట్టినప్పుడు controls అమలులో ఉండాలని కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము అంటున్నారని యీనాడు యీ బిల్లును తెచ్చినారా, లేక యీ ప్రభుత్వమువారికి యిట్లుమువచ్చినప్పుడు controls ఉంచేది, యిట్లుములేనప్పుడు తీసివేసే ఉద్దేశ్యముతో యీ బిల్లును తెచ్చారా అని అడుగుచున్నాను. అట్లాంటిప్పుడు యీ controls విషయములో ప్రభుత్వమువారి control policy ఏమిటో విశదముగా చెప్పవలసియున్నది. లేదా

24th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

ఒకవేళ యీ ప్రభుత్వము మరల controls ను అమలులోనికి తీసుకొనిరాదలస్తే control economy అన్న వస్తువుల విషయములో జరుపుతారా, లేక యింతవరకు విడుదల అయినటువంటి వస్తువులమీద మరల controls పెట్టుతారా? యీ విషయములో ప్రభుత్వమువారి ఉద్దేశ్యము ఏమని అడుగుచున్నాను. లేదా Planning Commission విధానము అమలులో ఉన్నంతకాలము యీ controls అమలులో ఉంచుటకు యీ ప్రభుత్వమువారు యిప్పుడు యీ కాలపరిమితిని పొడుగింపు అనే సాకుతో మరల controls ను పెట్టి నత్తు దిద్దుకోవలసి యీ బిల్లును తేచ్చారా అని అడుగుచున్నాను. కంట్రాల్స్ అమలు జరుపడలంటే చేయండి. అదికానప్పుడు యీ కాలపరిమితి పొడుగించడం సరియైనదికాదని చెప్పతూ యీ సవరణ బిల్లును వ్యతిరేకించుచు ప్రతిల అభిప్రాయమును కనుగొనవలెననేనా సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను—

'That the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952, be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon.'

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the amendment. In doing so, I beg to state that the Hon. Finance Minister was not correct when he said that the information I asked for was contained in the annexure circulated along with the Bill. For, I find that there is no annexure along with the Bill given to us.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am afraid the Hon. Leader of the House has not taken this House into his confidence to tell us what exactly are the reasons that have compelled him to bring this particular Bill at this particular moment. The information which he gave us in moving his motion is already contained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons contained in the Bill circulated to us. So, beyond repeating what is already contained there he has not cared to tell us anything else. He told us that this is a supplementary measure to the Central Act which has been in existence from 1949. He told us that this supplementary measure is necessary to enable the State Government to take power to control the supply and distribution of certain essential articles and to exclude from its scope the supply and distribution of certain other articles whose supply, distribution, transport, prices, etc., are or may be regulated by the Central Government. I find that the life of the present Act expires on 31st December 1952; and now, it is being sought to be extended for a further period, that is, up to 25th January 1955. I do not know how that date was arrived at; I fail to see the significance of that date. Perhaps the Central Act also has been extended up to that date. But that is a minor matter.

“ The main question which concerns us here, is, how did this State Government come to the conclusion that it is not necessary to control the production of certain commodities which are considered to be essential commodities. Under the existing Act there are given in the Schedule certain articles which are considered to be essential commodities. They are firewood, charcoal,

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [24th November 1952]

livestock, non-edible oilseeds, manures, electrical energy, all vat dyes, alizarine, other dyes used for textile printing, artificial silk yarn and motor vehicles (new or used). Sir, these are specific articles of public consumption, which Government considered to be essential articles and so they thought it necessary to exercise control over their production and distribution. Now what is it that makes Government think to-day that it is no longer necessary to control the production of certain of those articles but only their distribution? I am really unable to understand the logic of their reasoning. For, when there is no production in the country, I wonder, how Government are going to exercise their power over their distribution. What will happen is, the producer will take into his head to produce only a limited quantity, fix a higher price for it than at present obtains and thus create a monopoly and earn huge profits. So, I would ask the Hon. Finance Minister to explain to us what circumstances prevail in the country to-day to give up their control over production of the specific articles mentioned in the Schedule.

“ Then, Sir, there is another point I wish to mention here. There are certain essential articles which are now sought to be removed from the purview of this measure. They are ‘manures not being (i) fertilizers referred to in item (15) of the First Schedule to the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (Central Act LXV of 1951), or (ii) oil cakes, all vat dyes, alizarine, other dyes used for textile printing, artificial silk yarn, motor vehicles (new or used).’ After the passing of this amending Bill, this State Government will have no power over the production and distribution of these articles. Of course, the Hon. Finance Minister will say that if they are retained, in the exercise of our rights we will come into conflict with the powers vested in the Central Government. Sir, it is one thing for us to have powers and it is another thing to exercise those powers in a way that will conflict with the powers vested in the Central Government. So, why should we to-day surrender our powers under a hypothetical case that at a certain stage the Central Government may choose to exercise control? If and when that stage comes, why should not the Central Government delegate its powers to the State Government? Why should we not ask the Central Government to do that, so that we may ourselves exercise that power in the best interests of our people? So long as this House has inherent powers with respect to these matters, it is not right that we should relinquish them. Even with regard to the distribution of fertilisers, I would submit we should not relinquish our powers. I know we have no power over the production of fertilisers in Sindhri factory, where the major portion of fertilisers of this country is produced. Nor have this Government any power over the production of fertilisers at Alwaye. I realize that. But, Sir, as a matter of fact, the bulk of fertilisers coming into our State is imported fertilisers, and that is monopolised by the Imperial Chemical Industry. Now, why should this State Government relinquish its control over the distribution of the fertilisers?

24th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

Is it or is not not a fact that fertilisers are not made available 11-50 a.m.
to hundreds of thousands of peasants who are in need of them? There is maldistribution of fertilisers going on. There are, I know, hundreds of malpractices taking place in the distribution of fertilisers which are very much needed for agricultural operations. As a result of this Bill being passed into law, the Imperial Chemical Industries would have a monopoly of this much needed commodity which is badly needed by poor agriculturists and they would not be able to get it except at prohibitive cost. The Hon. Minister must give us cogent and convincing reasons as to why the Government consider it unnecessary to exercise control over all these things. Take again, for example, control over the production of charcoal and firewood. In a number of places forests are being burnt down for the production of charcoal. If forests are cut down for the manufacture of charcoal, then certainly we cannot get rains. Therefore, why should not the Government exercise control over the production of charcoal? I feel that Government have got to explain why these powers are no longer necessary to-day. It is immaterial for us whether the Government are going to exercise those powers or not. With regard to the extension of the life of the original Act proposed in the Bill, we agree, but with regard to other things stated in the Bill we oppose them."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very glad that the hon. Member, Sri Ramamurthi, has raised the point as to why the Government are giving up the powers which they are already having under the existing Act. Unfortunately, Sir, we are bound by the provisions of the Constitution. With reference to the provisions of this Bill we are governed by Article 304 of the Constitution, namely,

"Notwithstanding anything in Article 301 or Article 303, the Legislature of a State may by law.

(a)

(b) impose such reasonable restrictions on the freedom of trade, commerce or intercourse with or within that State as may be required in the public interest :

Provided that no Bill or amendment for the purpose of clause (b) shall be introduced or moved in the Legislature of a State without the previous sanction of the President."

"The State Legislature comes into the picture only under the above provision. Under the above Article of the Constitution no Bill or amendment for the purpose of clause (b) of Article 304 shall be introduced or moved in the Legislature without the previous sanction of the President. Therefore, we have to get the previous sanction of the President to introduce this Bill in the Legislature. As a matter of fact, our original proposal was to extend the life of the existing Act [the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Act, 1949], as it is, for three more years. But fortunately or unfortunately the Central Government thought it fit—and it is the Central Government who have got to give the consent because the President acts only on the advice of the Central Government—that certain provisions in the original Act should be deleted because they thought

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [24th November 1952]

that those provisions would come into conflict with the provisions of the Central Act. In pursuance of the above suggestion from the Central Government, we have deleted certain provisions from the existing Act. It is not as if we are not willing to have these powers even though we are not exercising them at present under the existing Act. Even if we require those powers we have to ask the Central Government to pass necessary legislation or give us specific authority under the existing central legislation. That is why, we have to bow down to the dictation of the Central Government in view of the provisions contained in the Constitution. I am glad that the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi agrees as to the necessity for extending the life of the present Act.

" Then the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi referred to the point as to why the life of this Bill should be extended only up to 25th January 1955. The Central Act has been extended up to 25th January 1955 and the present Bill after all is only complimentary to the Central Act.

" I have not understood the full implications of the speech of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah. I think he referred to controls or controlled economy with regard to production. As far as we are concerned, the policy of our Government with regard to the above is well known. Even under the existing Act, there are only seven orders in force with regard to the supply of electricity and there is also one order with regard to the distribution of cement. We have not passed any other orders under the existing Act. Our policy is that only when there is necessity we exercise the powers given to us under the Act, so that we may exercise sufficient control on the supply and distribution of essential articles. There is no use of circulating this Bill for the purpose of eliciting public opinion thereon. It should be left to the Government and to the Legislature to find out the circumstances and decide at what point control is necessary and at what point there should be decontrol. There is no use of referring a general matter like this for public opinion. I am quite sure that any responsible public person will certainly say that it is necessary for the Government to have these powers so that in times of emergency or in case of necessity they may impose controls in the larger interests of the community. I request Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah to withdraw his amendment that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting public opinion.

" As regards the complaint of not giving sufficient time, we took it for granted that hon. Members would be conversant with all the existing Acts and that it would not be necessary to give much time when the Bill is only for the extension of an existing Act. In the case of a new legislation, where new principles would have to be studied more time may be necessary. The present Bill has got to be passed by 31st December 1952. Not only that. We have also to get the assent of the President to the Bill within that time. I am sorry I could not give notice of the

24th November 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Bill earlier. As a matter of fact I was considering whether the present Act should be extended for three years or for one year. The Government came to the conclusion finally that it is very necessary to have the powers sought for in the Bill, particularly with reference to the supply of electricity.

"I once more request Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah to withdraw his amendment, and vote for the main motion before the House."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Before the motion is put to vote, I should like to elicit a piece of information from the Hon. Minister. I am glad that my speech has elicited an answer from the Hon. Minister as to the attitude of the Central Government with regard to this Bill and the circumstances under which this Bill has been brought forward before the Legislature in the form in which it has been presented to the House. In view of these facts, will the Hon. Minister consider it desirable to convey to the Government of India the feelings of the entire House that powers must be conferred on the State Government to legislate on these matters . . ."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I do not know whether the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi wants that the Constitution should be amended so that we should have unrestricted powers. The Central Government have also their own policy and we cannot dictate their policy from here. The Central Government have assured that all the necessary powers with regard to the carrying out of the provisions of this Bill would be given to us also in case of necessity. There is no question of our being left in the lurch in case there is any necessity to control production. Under the circumstances it is not necessary to convey, as suggested by Sri Ramamurthi, this view of alleged conflict between the Centre and the State."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అధ్యక్షా, నాయుక్కు సవరణ ఉపసంహరించుకోవడం అన్నప్పుడు శ్రీ సుబ్రమణ్యంగారు చెప్పినదానిలో కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము policy కిని, రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వము policy కిని జేడముచున్నట్లు కనబడుచున్నది. రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వమువారు controls అక్కరలేదని తినివేశారు. కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఉండాలని అంటున్నారు. కాని సుబ్రమణ్యంగారు చెప్పినదానిలో చూస్తే ప్రభుత్వమునకు control కు అధికారము ఉంటే, వీలుఅయినప్పుడు ఉపయోగించుకొనుటకు వీలుగావుంటుందని చెప్పుతున్నారు. అందువల్లనే యీ సవరణ బిల్లును తెచ్చామని అన్నారు. ఈ విషయములో ఒకమాట అడుగుతున్నాను. ఈ కంట్రోలు విధానములో కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికా, రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వానికా, ఎవరికి పూర్తి అధికారమున్నదో ఖచ్చితము (definite) గా చెప్పండి అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఈ కంట్రోలు విధానములో రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వము పాలసీ విమిటి, కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము policy విమిటి అనేది వివరించవలసియున్నది. రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వము కంట్రోల్స్ అక్కరలేదని తినివేశారు. పండిట్ నైరూ పర్యటనలో కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము కంట్రోల్స్ అన్నియు అమలులోనే ఉండాలని చెప్పారు. ఈ రెండింటిలో controls ఉండడమ, తిని

12
noon.

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [24th November 1952]

నేయడమా, విది ఉపయోగము, ఎవరి అధికారము ఎంతవరకు ఆవసరము అనేది తేల్చి చెప్పవలెను. ఒకచోట ఈ కంట్రోల్స్ విషయములో కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వ విధానమునకు రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వ విధానము వ్యతిరేకముగా ఉన్నప్పుడు, ఏ విధానము అవలంబించుట ఆవసరమో ప్రజానీకమునకు తెలియజెప్పటం ఆవసరమైయున్నది. అట్లు చేయకపోతే ఎవరి యిష్టము వచ్చినట్లు వారు నడిస్తే, యిది ప్రజానీకానికి అన్యాయము చేసినట్లు తుంది. ఈ విధానములో ఏ ప్రభుత్వము ప్రజలమీద వాధ్యత వహిస్తుందని అడుగు చున్నాను. Essential articles తయారుచేయడం, కంట్రోలు చేయడం అనేది కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వ విధానం ప్రకారం అమలు జరిపేయడం ఒక సలహా వట్టం కావాలంటే నాకేమీ అభ్యంతరములేదు. ఈ విషయములో ప్రజానిశాచయమును గుర్తించి అమలులో తెట్టవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. అయితే Central Government చేయ మూనిన control విధానం అమలు జరపటానికి యింకను ఎంతకాలం పట్టుకో తెలియ జేయవలెనని మంత్రిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను. ”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, I am at a very great disadvantage in not having been able to follow the very eloquent speech made by the hon. Member. I am sure he has raised very pertinent points. But, unfortunately, I am unable to follow them. If any hon. Member could give me a gist of the points I shall try to reply, if necessary.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I am afraid I will not be able to do justice to what Mr. Vavilala has spoken, for I did not hear him properly as I did not think it would come to my lot to give a gist of what he has spoken. What he wants to make out is this, whether the policy of this Government and the policy of the Central Government are in accord on this matter. If the Central Government want control—and that is the information, and at any rate Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has said that willy-nilly there must be control—what is the policy of this Government with regard to the attitude of the Central Government? Are they going to follow the Central Government fully or are they going to say, ‘ We shall have our own way and shall not have controls ’. People are anxious to know something about this conflict, growing conflict and the partial conflict either in theory or in application between these two Governments.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ There is absolutely no conflict between the Central Government and this Government with regard to the policy of control. If the hon. Member will be pleased to go through the statement of the Prime Minister, it will be seen that he also says that controls will be lifted wherever possible and that controls will be continued where they are absolutely necessary. As a matter of fact, this Bill is only for the purpose of imposing controls, and if therefore Mr. Vavilala thinks that the policy of the Central Government is to continue controls, this Bill also seeks to take powers for the purpose of continuing the controls. So, Sir, all this talk of conflict between the Central Government and this Government with regard to the policy of control or decontrol is merely wishful

24th November 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

thinking. As I said, there is no such conflict. In fact, we are bringing forward this Bill with the full accord of the Central Government and in accordance with the wishes of the Central Government. Therefore, the question of conflict need not disturb our minds now and we may proceed with the Bill."

*SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వ కంట్రోలు విధానమును అమలు జరుపుతున్నామని ఆర్థిక మంత్రిగారు చెప్పిన state-ment లోని హామీని గమనించి నా సవరణను నేను withdraw చేస్తున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I hope the House gives permission to Mr. Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah to withdraw the amendment.”

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I will now put the original motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘ That the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952 be taken into consideration at once.’ ”

The Motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I will now put the clauses to the vote of the House. I find there are no amendments to the clauses.”

*SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ ఈ సవరణ బిల్లు విషయములో ఏదైన సవరణ ఉన్నదంటే అది clausewise గా చర్చించుట అవసరమని అంటున్నాను. ఇప్పుడు నాయొక్క సవరణ తారీఖులకు సంబంధించినదే.”

(My amendment is only with reference to the date.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member has not given notice of any amendment.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ With reference to dates, he says, he has given notice of an amendment.”

*SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ నేను యిచ్చిన సవరణ మీ కాగితములూ దూస్తే చూడుకుతుందండి. ఒకటే కాగితముమీద రెండు amendments ను యిచ్చియున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ To whom has the hon. Member given notice of the amendment.”

*SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ నేను యిచ్చిన రెండు amendments కున్నా ఒకటే పైపు అయింది. రెండవది పైపు కాలేదు.

“ నా సవరణ అంక 1955 వ సం॥ జనవరి 26 వ తేది తర్వాతగూడా యీ controls అమలులో ఉండాలని అంటున్నాను. అనగా యీ controls శాశ్వతముగా అమలుపరచవలె నా ఉద్దేశ్యము. గనుక యీ సవరణ బిల్లులో తారీఖులు లేకుండా అమలుకులేస్తే, అది legal గా రద్దు కాకుండా అమలులో ఉంటుంది అని చెప్పుచున్నాను.”

[24th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I will look into the matter and in the meanwhile let the hon. Member say what his amendment is? ”

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఈ Essential Articles Controls సవరణ బిల్లుకు నా సవరణ 1952 వ సం॥ డిసెంబరు 31 వ తేదీ నుంచి, 1955 వ సం॥ జనవరి 25 వ తారీఖులు అనే యీ బిల్లులో ఉదహరించడం అనవసరమని తెచ్చాను. దీనినికూడా ఒక శాసనము చేసేటప్పుడు, తారీఖులు లేకుండా చేస్తే మంచిదని నా సవరణ. అట్లు చేసేటప్పుడు యీ యాక్టు రద్దు అయ్యే వరకు యిది అమలులో ఉండగలదు. మన యొక్క ముఖ్యద్దేశము యీ control శాశ్వతముగా యీ Essential Articles మీద ఉండగలదంటే. కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్దేశ్యముగూడా యీ control ఎల్లప్పుడు ఉండవలసిన అంటున్నారు. అందుచేత యీ బిల్లు తారీఖులు లేకుండా శాశ్వత control కు శాసనము చేయమని కోరుతున్నాను. ఇక యీ బిల్లును repeal చేసేవరకు యిది అమలులో ఉండగలదు.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ The hon. Member wants the omission of the dates in Clause 3.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member may move the amendment when we come to that Clause.”

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ On a point of order, Sir. ఈ సభలో శాసన సభ్యులు కొందరు తెలుగు భాషలో”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member knows English and he can say anything he wants in English.”

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఈ సభలో శాసన సభ్యులు కొందరు తెలుగుభాషలో మాట్లాడుతున్నప్పుడు, ఆ మాటలను translate చేయటమనే ఒక translator ను వేసి, translation కు సదుపాయాలను కలుగజేయమని Speaker గారిని యిదివరకే కోరియున్నాను. అలాంటిది యింత వరకూ జరుగులేదు. అలాంటప్పుడు మేము తెలుగు భాషలో విమోచన చెప్పితే, Speaker గారికి అర్థముకాకుండా ఉన్న ను రూలింగు యివ్వడమనేది జరుగుచున్నది. ఈ విషయములో Speaker గారు విమోచనా ఆలోచించారా! మేము చెప్పేది అర్థము కాకుండా ఉన్నప్పుడు Speaker గారు సభాకార్యక్రమము నడపడము విచారము సలబుకాదు. ఈ రోజునగూడా మేము చెప్పేది అర్థము కాకుండా కార్యక్రమము నడపడమనేది ఎంత సబబో ఆలోచించమని కోరుతున్నాను. అర్థము కావడము, కాక పోవడము, అదంతా వేరే విషయము. Translator ను వేసి, translation కు సదుపాయాలు చేయడము విషయములో విమోచన చెప్పుతారు? గనుక యిప్పుడు జరిపే వద్దలి తప్పించి, తక్షణమే translator ను వేయడమనేది ప్రభుత్వముమీద బాధ్యత ఉందని చెప్పుతున్నాను.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The point of order raised by the hon. Member is that we should appoint a translator.”

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ అందుకని నేను మరిల యీ రోజున reminder ను యిస్తున్నాను. ఇప్పుడు జరిగే కార్యక్రమము

24th November 1952] [Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu]

సరియైన translation సమపాయాలు త్వరలో చేయించమని Speaker గారిని, ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను. యీ అర్థముకాని కార్యక్రమము నడిపించుట సబబుకాదని మనవిచేస్తూ, యీ విషయములో త్వరలో translator ను అప్పాయింట్లు చేయగలండులకు కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ విషయములో యిదివరకు ఎక్కో పార్టు point of order raise చేసియున్నానని remind చేస్తున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I will consider the hon. Member's point of order if he puts it in writing and sends it to me.

"It appears that the hon. Member, Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah has given notice of an amendment to Clause 3. When we come to Clause 3, the hon. Member may move his amendment.

"I will now put Clause 2 to the vote of the House."

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 3.

*SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అధ్యక్ష, ఈ బిల్లును 12-10 P.M. pass చేయడమంటే దీనియొక్క ముఖ్యఉద్దేశ్యము ఏమిటో గమనించాలి. ప్రజలకు ఎక్కువ సౌకర్యాలు యీ essential articles విషయములో చెయ్యవలెనని గదా! అందుకనే నేను ఈ రోజున యీ బిల్లుకు సవరణ తెచ్చియున్నాను. ఈ సవరణ బిల్లు విషయములో ప్రభుత్వమువారి ఉద్దేశ్యమేమిటి? ఎంతవరకు చర్యజరిగింది? దీనియొక్క ప్రధానస్ఫూర్తిమేమిటి? ఈ స్ఫూర్తాలు ఎలావుండాలి, యీ essential articles మీద ఏ విధమైన కంట్రోలు ఉండాలి అనేదే మనము ఆలోచించాలి. కంట్రోలు ఆఫ్ తర్యాత యిది శాశ్వతముగా ఉండాలనే నాకోరిక. గనుక నేను చెప్పేది ఏమిటంటే యిప్పుడు control economy Central Government జరపటానికి శాశ్వతముగా జరిపించాలని నేను చెప్పుతున్నాను. శాశ్వతముగా జరపడానికి నేను వ్యతిరేకించడములేదు. అందుకని యీ బిల్లులో తారీఖులు లేకుండా చేస్తే యిది శాశ్వతముగా యీ controls పెట్టినట్లయి అట్లా శాశ్వతాధికారము ప్రభుత్వానికి కలిగియంటే అమలు ఎప్పుడుపడితే అప్పుడు జరుపవచ్చును. అక్కర లేనప్పుడు అక్కరలేకుండా చేసుకోవచ్చును. అట్లా వీలుగా ఉండే అధికారమును యీ బిల్లుపల్ల ప్రభుత్వానికి సమాధింపమని ఆర్థికమంత్రిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను. అందు చేత నేను యీ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించుచు ఆంగీకరించామని ఆర్థిక మంత్రిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను—

'In clause 3, delete the words "up to and inclusive of the 31st December 1952" and the words "up to and inclusive of the 25th January 1955."'

MR. SPEAKER:—"The amendment is—

'In clause 3 of the Bill the words "up to and inclusive of the 31st December 1952" and the words "up to and inclusive of the 25th January 1955.'

That is, he wants to delete all references to dates. It is a negative amendment. Whether he moves the amendment or opposes the Clause itself it comes to the same thing. Let him therefore oppose the Clause instead of moving the amendment."

[24th November 1952]

*SRI ALLURI VENKATRAMA RAJU :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఈ ఆమెండు మొట్ట మొట్టా మాకు తెలియజేయకుండా, దాని కాపీలను మాకు పంపకుండా, చర్చను సాగించి వోటు చేయమని ప్రజాస్వామిక సిద్ధాంతాలకు అనుగుణంగా ఉన్నదా అని point of order ను raise చేస్తున్నాను. సవరణ విషయం మాకు వ్రాత మూలంగా తెలియజేయవలసిన కోరుకున్నాను. ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let the hon. Member Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah continue his speech. Then I will allow the hon. Member to raise the point of order. ”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I suppose the object of the amendment is to make the measure a permanent one. If the amendment is accepted as it stands, the present Act will expire on the 31st December 1952 which, I suppose, is not the object of the mover of the amendment. Whether we should have a permanent measure or a temporary measure is an altogether different question. The very Preamble of this Bill is : Whereas it is expedient further to amend the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (*Temporary Powers*) Act. . . . When the original Act itself is a Temporary Powers Act, the amending Act also can only be temporary. When we want to have control or decontrol, this House should have a dominant voice in formulating the policy. If the Act is for a temporary period, the Government will have to come before this House at the expiry of the period, if necessary, and then the House can express its opinion. If the measure is made a permanent one, then there is no opportunity for this House to express its opinion as to whether controls should continue or not. We are taking powers up to the 25th January 1955. I hope Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah will be in this House at the expiry of the period. Then this House can take stock of the situation, instead of making this Act a permanent one. Nothing is lost by limiting the period of this Act to the 25th January 1955. Therefore I request the hon. Member not to press his amendment. ”

Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu began to speak in Telugu.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member may please speak in English, as he knows English. ”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ శమరు ఆమెండు మొట్ట మొట్టా చదివి వినిపించారు. అది విషయం ఇంగ్లీషు తెలిసినవారికి అర్థమవుతుంది. కాని ఈ సభలో ఇంగ్లీషు తెలియనివారు చాలామంది ఉన్నారు. వారికి ఈ విషయమై ఏమీ బోధపడటంలేదని point of order ను raise చేస్తున్నాను. ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Not now. The amendment has already been moved and discussed. ”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఈ సవరణ విషయం చుట్టూ సభ్యులకు బోధపడలేదు. చర్చనీయాంశమేమో తెలియకుండా వోటు చేయటం ఎటుల అని గౌరవ సభ్యులు కొందరు తమ అభ్యంతరాన్ని తెలియజేస్తున్నారు. ”

24th November 1952] [Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu]

ముఖ్యంగా తెలుగులో మాట్లాడు సభ్యులు తెలియజేస్తున్న విషయాలు తమకు బోధ పడులు లేనట్లు కనుపిస్తున్నది. ఇట్టి ఇబ్బందులు కలుగకుండుటకుగాను సభ్యులు చెప్పు దానిని ఇంగ్లీషులోనికి అనువదించి తమకు తెలియజేయు నిమిత్తం కొందరు ఉద్యోగు లను నియమించవలసిన ఉద్దేశ్యం కోరి ఉన్నాము. ఆ విషయమై ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఎట్టి శ్రద్ధ చూపినట్లు కనుపించుటలేదు. ”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I am only a novice, but still I presume to tell what exactly the hon. Member Mr. Venkateswarlu has submitted now to the Chair. He seems to submit that copies of the amendment should be distributed in English to the House before it is put to vote whatever may have been done by way of discussion, but, unfortunately, he does not seem to remember the fact that notice of the amendment has been given by the Telugu gentleman, if I may be allowed to say, by the fanatical Telugu gentleman, in English. (Hon. Members: ‘No, no.’) The amendment is written in English.”

12.20
p.m.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The amendment is written in English.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The amendment has been given in English, both in ink and in pencil. The amendment has been read by the Chair just now. The amendment will convert the measure into futility. This has been discussed, and it has been more or less given up.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, I think the Hon. the Chief Minister only as a matter of humour called him ‘fanatical’, and I do not think it is anything more than that.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ It is nothing more than that. I have proved that he is not fanatical. What was meant by the joke was that the hon. Member Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah had written his amendment in English, and in ink and in pencil.”

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ అంతే కాకుండా ఈ ఆమెండుమెంటు వంటి చాలా రోజులైనదని శ్రీ గోపాలకృష్ణయ్యగారు చెప్పు తున్నారు. ఇట్టి సందర్భములో ఆమెండుమెంటు కాపీలను సభ్యులకు ఇవ్వనిదే ఈ చర్చ కొనసాగించడం సరియైన విధానమా అనే విషయమై తమ దూలింగు ఇవ్వవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను ”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, the point of order raised by the hon. Member Mr. Venkateswarlu is this. It is not a question of whether the hon. Member had given notice of the amendment in English or in any other language. The question that is raised is that once the amendment has been submitted to the office, copies of that amendment should be made available to every Member, before it is actually put to vote.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Notice of this amendment was given just a few minutes before. We had no time to circulate copies of it to hon. Members.”

[24th November 1952]

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ నా సవరణకు technical గా ఏదో అభ్యంతరమున్నదనిచెప్పిన కారణంవల్ల, అంతేగాక మంత్రిగారు ఇచ్చిన హామీబట్టి ఈ సవరణను ఉపసంహరించుకొనుట ఈ శాసనసభవారు, నా సవరణను బలపరచినవారు ఆమోదించవలెనని కోరుచున్నాను.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, the hon. Member seeks the permission of the House to withdraw his amendment.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ It is for the Chair, and not for the hon. Member, to ask whether the House gives permission to the Member to withdraw the amendment. I hope the House gives him permission to withdraw the amendment.”

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 3 was put and carried.

Clauses 4, 5 and 6.

Clauses 4, 5 and 6 were put and carried.

Preamble and Clause 1.

Clause 1 and the Preamble were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, I move—

‘ That the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’ ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’ ”

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

(2) THE MADRAS SURVEY AND BOUNDARIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill ^a, 1952, and move—

‘ That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.’

Sir, under this Act survey is being done, and especially now, it is being done on a very extensive scale. There are three sections which provide for appeals against decisions under these sections. Under section 8, which refers only to the cost of the survey and the survey mark, there is an appeal. Under the present law, only when all these appeals are disposed of, a notification under section 13 could be issued. But I submit, Sir, that the decision under section 8 is only in regard to the cost of the survey and the survey

24th November 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

mark. By retarding the issue of a notification under section 13, in order to await the decision on the appeal under section 8, the issue of the notification is unduly put off. Under this Bill, a decision under section 8 could be appealed against apart from the decisions under the other sections, namely, sections 9 and 10. An appeal under section 8 would stand apart. As it involves only cost, it need not retard the other notification. Therefore, I move that this amendment may be accepted in order to facilitate the issue of the notification under section 13. It does not affect the other provisions under sections 9 and 10. It affects only the decision under section 8, for which a separate appeal is now provided. It deals with only the question of cost. Sir, I move the Bill."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The motion is—

' That the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.' "

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, I want to know what would happen if on a question decided under section 8 which necessarily will have to be considered on an appeal under section 11 the Appellate authority comes to a contrary decision. The best thing the Government can do is to have provisional powers to proceed with the maintenance work and not have final powers under section 8. The appeal under section 11 will necessarily affect the correctness or otherwise of the order passed under section 8. Therefore, instead of having two appellate authorities in respect of matters arising from one transaction, the Government, for the purpose of maintenance work, can have provisional powers and not final powers."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I am sorry I have not made myself clear. The only question arising under section 8 is the cost, and for that provision is made. The cost may be more or less. Whatever may be the result it does not affect the notification. It is only regarding the cost, which may be more or less, the appellate authority may decide."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.' "

The motion was carried.

Clauses 2, 3, 1 and the Preamble were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

' That the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.' "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.' "

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

[24th November 1952]

(3) THE MADRAS SUGAR FACTORIES CONTROL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952.

12-30
P.m.

* THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952 and move—

‘ That the Bill be taken into consideration at once. ’ ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Motion moved—

‘ That the Madras Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once. ’

“ The hon. Member Sri P. Ramamurthi has given notice of an amendment to this Bill. But he is not present here now.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I shall move it on his behalf, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ No, only the hon. Member who has given notice of it can move it. I am going to put the motion to the vote of the House.”

(The Hon. Dr. R. Nagan Gouda was seen rising in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Does the Hon. Minister want to say anything? ”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I think, Sir, some explanation is required from the Hon. Minister on this Bill.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ If the Hon. Minister wants to say anything, I have no objection.”

* THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the principal Act of 1949 provides that any sugarcane-grower in a reserved area may offer to sell a specified quantity of the sugarcane, which may be grown by him, to the sugar factories before the planting season. The State Advisory Committee on Sugarcane suggested that it would be more convenient for the growers if the time for offering cane to the sugar factories was fixed at any time before the close of the planting season. Further, it was found that the definition of the ‘ grower ’ of sugarcane required amendment so as to include co-operative societies consisting of sugarcane growers. That has been provided for in this Bill.

“ Then, according to the principal Act, sugarcane-growers are required to sell cane in the reserved area only to the specified factory-owners. But in this Bill provision is made enabling growers, who own not more than five acres of land each within the reserved area, either to crush or to sell, for the purpose of making gur within the same reserved area, the sugarcane grown by them. These are things that have been found essential for the proper working of the Sugar Factories Control Act. That is why this Amending Bill has been brought forward.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—“ అప్పడా, ఈ సవరణ బిల్లు గురించి తెలుసుకొనుటకు సభ్యులకు సరిపోయినంత వ్యవధి ఇవ్వకపోవడం చాలా ఇబ్బంది కలిగజేసిన

24th November 1952] [Sri K. Govinda Rao]

దని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా జిల్లాలనుంచి వచ్చేటటువంటి నాటోటివారికి ఈ బిల్లు కాపీలు చాలా ఆలస్యంగా చేరినవి. ఈ కారణంవల్లనే సవరణలను ఇవ్వడం కష్టమేదు. ఇకముందైనా ట్టెట్టి ఆఫీసర్లకు కలుగకుండా, బిల్లుల కాపీలను ముందుగానే సభ్యులకు అందునట్లు చేయవలెనని అభ్యర్థించాలని కోరుతున్నాను.

“గత నాల్గు, అయిదు సంవత్సరములుగా చెరుకు పండించే రైతులు ఎన్నో ఇబ్బందులకు గురికావలసివస్తోందనేది అందరికీ తెలిసిన విషయమే. అనేక సంభక్తులలో కల్లబాక్సు పరిశుభ్రత కారణం మిల్లు యజమానులు చెరుకు తీసికోవడంవల్ల రైతులు ఎన్నో కష్టనష్టాలకు లోనుగావలసి వచ్చినది. ఈ ఇబ్బందులనుంచి రైతులను పరిరక్షించుటకుగాను ఉద్దేశించబడిన ఈ బిల్లు కొంతవరకు పరిగానే ఉన్నదని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. అయినప్పటికీ దీనిని ఇంకా సమగ్రంగా చేయవలసిన అవసరం కూడా ఉన్నది. పంచదార ఫ్యాక్టరీల యజమానులు రైతులు తెచ్చే చెరుకును సకాలంలో కొనక, కొనిన చెరుకుకు సక్రమమైన ధర ఇవ్వక, వెంటనే డబ్బు చెల్లించక చాలా ఇబ్బందులు పెడుతున్నారనే విషయం వ్యవసాయశాఖా చాతుర్యలకుపాడా తెలిసినట్టిదే. ఈ సంవత్సరం నూర్చిలో తీసుకోన్న చెరుకుకు ఇంతవరకు వెల చెల్లించలేదనే విషయం కూడా మంత్రిగారు ఎరుగుదురు. మిల్లు యజమానులు ఈ విధంగా అక్రమంగా ప్రవర్తిస్తున్నారని అడుపులో పెట్టె అవకాశాలు ఈ బిల్లులో కలుగజేయలేదు. రైతులకు సకాలంగా, సరసమైన ధర చెల్లించకపోయినట్లయితే శిక్షకు పాత్రులౌతారనే నిబంధన బిల్లులో లేకపోయినట్లయితే మిల్లు యజమానులు వాటి యిష్టం ప్రకారం రైతులను ఎన్నో ఇబ్బందులపాలుచేస్తారని మనవిచేస్తాను.

“అయిదు ఎకరములుగాని, అంతకన్న తక్కువగాని ఉన్న రైతులు తాము పండించే చెరుకుతో బెల్లం తయారుచేసుకోవచ్చుననే అవకాశం కలుగజేయడం మంచిదే. అదేవిధంగా ఇతర రైతులకు కూడా సావకాశం కలుగజేయవలెనని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఆ విధమైన అవకాశం లేకపోయినట్లయితే చెరుకు పండించే రైతులందరూ మిల్లు యజమానుల దయాదాక్షిణ్యాలపై ఆధారపడవలసి వస్తుంది.

“ముఖ్యంగా శ్రమ్యులలోని పంచదార మిల్లు యజమానులు చేస్తున్న అక్రమాలు గురించగోరాలి. ఆ మిల్లు యజమానుల రైతులవద్దనుంచి చెరుకును ప్రభుత్వ శ్రమ్యులకు ప్రకారం కొనుటలేదు. రైతులకు సరియైన ధర ఇవ్వడంలేదు. కొన్ని సదుకును వెల చెల్లించడంలో ఎంతో ఆలస్యం చేస్తున్నారు. ఇటువంటి అక్రమాలు చేయకుండా ప్రభుత్వం వివిధరకాలు తీసుకున్నదని మంత్రిగారిని అడుగుతున్నాను. మిల్లు యజమానులు ప్రభుత్వ శ్రమ్యులకు చెల్లించినట్లయితే ఆరు నెలలు శిక్ష లేక రెండువేల రూపాయలు జరిమానా విధించవలెనని ఈ బిల్లులో ఒక section ఉన్నది. ఈ శిక్ష వల్ల మిల్లు యజమానులను సరిచేయడం సాధ్యపడదు. అక్షాది రూపాయలు లాభాలు సంపాదించే మిల్లు యజమానులకు రెండువేల రూపాయలు జరిమానా చెల్లించడం విమంతులైనదియే. మిల్లు యజమానులు రైతులను ఇబ్బందులు పెట్టుకుంటే ఉండాలంటే జరిమానా విధించటం మారు రెండుసంవత్సరాలు జుయలు శిక్ష విధించుటకు వీలుగా బిల్లులోని clause ను సవరించవలెనని కోరుచున్నాను.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Amending Bill that has been moved looks, on the face of it, a very innocuous one. On the face of it, the amendments seem to be consequential upon the amendment to the definition clause wherein the 'crushing season' is now sought to be defined in a way different

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [24th November 1952]

from that in which it had been defined in the original Act. But, apart from this, there are certain other questions, in connection with the working of the existing Sugar Factories Control Act, which have got to be considered. I want to take this opportunity to ask the Government to take the House into confidence and enable it to examine the entire scope of the original Act itself and its working and find out in what ways it needs modification. Of course, it is now sought to be made out that previously all cane-growers in a registered area were compelled to sell their cane to the factory-owners, and that now a very big concession is sought to be given to all those people who grow cane over an area of five acres and less. It appears, on the face of it, to be a big concession for the small cane-growers. But, I would like to point out that it is not a concession at all. On the other hand, it is a retrograde step in the conditions existing now. At a time when the price of cane was very high and when the cane-growers could sell their cane at a high price in the open market, the Government prohibited the sale of cane to people other than the scheduled factory-owners. But to-day, we know that the prices of cane tumbled down last year. Particularly it was so in March 1952. As a result of this, small cane-growers were absolutely ruined. In a number of districts small cane-growers were not able to market their cane and they found it unprofitable to convert cane into gur. That was the position then. The Government did not take any steps to improve matters and help the small cane-growers. At that time when the small growers were not able to sell their cane to factory-owners at a reasonable price, they were not given any assistance. Now, in this Bill the Government say that the small growers should be enabled either to crush or to sell the cane for the purpose of making gur, and that they should be given freedom to do this. Of course, freedom is necessary. But, where is freedom? What have the Government done in the past? They have not taken the needs of the situation that existed in the past into consideration. Though this Bill appears to confer a boon on the small cane-growers, I may state that in actual practice the small cane-growers will be put to very great hardship. On the other hand, other provisions have to be incorporated in the Bill so that the small growers may be really helped.

“ There is another question to be considered. In the past, difficulties were experienced with regard to the marketing and sale of cane even by registered cane-growers. As a matter of fact, last year the Pugalur Factory owner refused to take the cane even from registered growers. He broke the contract. The Government were powerless to do anything in the matter, although their attention was drawn to the refusal of the factory-owner to take the cane from the growers. Thus the contract was broken by the factory-owner and the poor peasants who had grown the cane at the instance of the owner had to lose very heavily as a result of the refusal of the owner to take the same. Therefore, I suggest that we must go into the working of the Act and see how the Bill can be amended so that the small growers, the poor peasants and the real

12-40
P.M.

24th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

peasants are protected and are able to find an adequate market for their cane. That is what is needed at the present juncture. Therefore I suggest that the Government may agree to the reference of this Bill to a Select Committee. There is also a precedent for doing this."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member was not in his seat when I called his name."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, I was saying that there is a precedent for referring such a Bill to a Select Committee. Recently the Preventive Detention (Amendment) Bill was under discussion in the Central Parliament."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The whole Act was under discussion."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" When that Bill was under discussion, a request was made to the Central Government that the Select Committee should not be restricted to examine only the amendments that were already proposed, but it should also go into the original Act and suggest amendments to that Act. This suggestion was accepted by the Central Government and the Select Committee went into the working of the entire Act. I would like to appeal to the Government to follow that precedent. After all, we are interested in seeing that the poor peasant is protected. We are also interested in seeing that the small cane-growers are protected as much as other sections of people. Hundreds of cases have been brought before the Government, on the floor of the House and by various other means, where the small cane-growers have suffered a good lot because of the malpractices committed in the working of the Act. There has been favouritism and all sorts of things. We must see what are the steps that can be taken to give a fair deal to the small growers who are now sought to be freed. Now that the present amending Bill is before the House, I think the Government should find no difficulty in agreeing to refer it to a Select Committee. Unfortunately, I was not present in the House this morning when my name was called and so I was not able to move my amendment. Of course, it is a mistake and I must say it is a small technical mistake. But, I would request the Government not to take shelter under this technical mistake, but to agree to refer the Bill to a Select Committee so that the working of the entire Act can be effectively gone into. This amending Bill provides us an opportunity to review the situation. It will take a long time for non-official Bills to come before the House and get passed. Hence I appeal to the Government to agree to my request. When such an opportunity is provided, I think the House is entitled to review the working of the Act as a whole and suggest such amendments as are necessary for protecting the interests of the poor peasants and small cane-growers."

* SRI M. LAKSHMANASWAMI :—" అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లులో అయిదు ఎకరాలలో పైన ఉన్న టువంటి రైతులను మినహాయిస్తూ ఒక ప్రతిపాదన వున్నది.

[Sri M. Lakshmanaswami] [24th November 1952]

ఈ విధంగా ఒక 5 ఎకరాలను మాత్రము మినహాయించటంవల్ల ఈ సమస్యంతా పరిష్కారం అవుతుందా అనే ప్రశ్న వస్తున్నది. ఏ రైతైనా సరే చెరుకు పండించేటప్పుడు, తనకు అది గిట్టుబాటు అవుతుందా అనే ప్రశ్న ఒకటి తనలో ఉత్పత్తి అవుతుంది. కనుక ప్రభుత్వము ఈ రోజున ఈ విషయమై ఆలోచించేటప్పుడు ఏ రైతుకైనా సరే. ఈ చిల్లవల్ల చెరుకు పండించటంలో తనకు గిట్టుబాటు అవుతుందా, లేదా, రైతుకు ఇది వివిధంగా అవ్వచ్చును అనే విషయాన్ని ఆలోచించడం అవసరమైయున్నది. ఇది వరకూ ఈ రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వము చెరుకు ధరలను నిర్ణయించేందుకు కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి recommend చేసివున్నది, ఆ ధరలను కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము నిర్ణయించిన ధరలకంటే తక్కువగా అనగా రూ 1-2-0 లు ప్రకారం నిర్ణయించారు. ఈ విధంగా కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి recommend చేయడమనే విషయం చెరుకు పండించేటటువంటి రైతానికి ఒక ముఖ్యమైన సమస్యగా ఉన్నది. ఏ రైతైనా సరే, ఈ రోజు ధరలు guarantee లేనప్పుడు, తనకు దానివల్ల గిట్టుబాటు లేనప్పుడు, అటువంటి పంటకు చూసుకొనే ఇష్టము ఉండదు. కనుక రైతుకు ఈ నిర్బంధాలలో చెరుకు పండితే గిట్టుబాటు అవుతుందా లేదా అనే ప్రశ్న గురించి ఆలోచించవలసియున్నది. ఇప్పుడు ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్న క్లాజు ప్రకారం 5 ఎకరాలను మినహాయించడమేగాని ఏ రైతైనా సరే, తనకు ఇష్టము ఉంటే ఫ్యాక్టరీకి చెరుకును ఇవ్వకోవచ్చు, లేకపోలే వేరేవిధంగా అప్పుకోవచ్చునని దానికి ఇందులో అవకాశమివ్వడంలేదు. కనుక ఈ రీతిగా దీనిలో మార్పు చేయవలసియున్నది. అలాగే మిల్లు యజమానులకు పరిష్కృతి సరిగా ఇవ్వకపోవడంవల్ల ఇబ్బందులు పడుతున్నారు. అవిధంగా రైతులు సరకును సరిగా మిల్లు యజమానులకు అమ్ములేకపోతున్నారు. ఈ ఇబ్బందులన్నీ తొలగించేటటువంటి తగిన బండ్ బండ్లు ఇందులో లేవు. అందువల్ల శ్రీ రామమూర్తిగారు చెప్పినట్లుగా ఈ బిల్లును ఒక సెలెక్టు కమిటీకి పేసి మొత్తము చిల్లవంతా సరిగా సవరించేందుకు వీలకలుగజేయవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈ చిల్ల ముఖ్యంగా మిల్లు యజమానుల క్రింద sugarcane growers ను కట్టిపెట్టడానికి విస్తరించటంవంటి చిల్లగా నాకు కనిపిస్తున్నది. ఇందులో ప్రత్యేకంగా చిన్న రైతుకు ఏదో మేలు కలుగజేస్తున్నట్లు పైకి కనిపించడమేకాని, మొత్తానికి మిల్లు యజమానులకు ఈ sugarcane అంతా వచ్చుజెప్పుడానికి ఒక restriction విస్తరించినట్లుగా కనిపిస్తున్నది. నిజమే, పంచదార ఎక్కువ కావాలి. ఫ్యాక్టరీలు పనిచేసి పంచదార తయారుచేయాలి. కాని దీనితో మిల్లు యజమానులు ఉన్నారు, రైతులు ఉన్నారు. ఇది వీరిద్దరికీ సంబంధించిన విషయము. రైతులు పండించేటటువంటి చెరుకుకు సరియైనటువంటి ధర నిర్ణయించి ఆ ధరకు మిల్లు యజమానులు కొనేటట్లుగా చూడవలసిన బాధ్యత ప్రభుత్వమునకు ఉన్నది. అటువంటి నిర్ణయం ఇందులోలేదు ఎప్పుడైతే రైతులు నిర్మింభంగా ఆయా రిజర్వుడు areas లకు నిర్ణయించిన మిల్లు యజమానులకు తక్కువగా ఇవ్వాలని నిర్బంధించడం జరుగుతుందో, అంతకుముందు Tariff Board నిర్ణయించిన ధరలకు మిల్లు యజమానులు జేరుకును కొనడానికి సాకరించి ఆ ధరలను నిర్ణయించేస్తూ, ఆ విధంగా రైతులకు నష్టము కలిగేటటువంటి పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడతాయి. ఇక కొంతవరకే సాఫ్ట్ గ్రోవ క్రింద grow చేసినటువంటి వాటినికూడా ఈ మాదిరి ఫ్యాక్టరీలకే కట్టిపెట్టడం జరుగుతుంది. కనుక ఇది మొత్తంమీద పైకి ఏదో కొంతమంది చిన్న రైతులకు లాభముగా కనిపించినప్పటికీ, ఎక్కువ పెట్టుబడిపెట్టి తమ లాభాలనే ప్రధాన ఆశయముగా పెట్టుకొన్నటువంటి మిల్లు యజమానులకే ఎక్కువ మేలు కలుగజేయ

24th November 1952] [Sri C. V. K. Rao]

దానికి పూనుకొనినటువంటిదిగా ఉన్నది. స్వేచ్ఛ అనేటటువంటిది ఇందులో ఎవరికి లేకుండా యున్నది. కనుక, శ్రీ రామమూర్తిగారు చెప్పినట్లుగా దీనిని పూర్తిగా పరిశీలించవలసియున్నది. ముత్తము దీని original Act నే పూర్తిగా పరిశీలించి, దీని వల్ల నిజంగా sugarcane growers కు లాభము ఉన్నదా లేదా, ఏ వర్గానికి ఎక్కువ లాభము కలుగజేయదానికి ప్రభుత్వము ప్రయత్నం చేస్తున్నది అనే విషయాన్ని అలా కూడా స్పష్టంగా విమర్శించాలి. ఈ విధంగా విమర్శించి, రైతులకు మిల్లు యజమానులకు, consumers కు దీనివల్ల తగినటువంటి లాభము ఉండేటట్లుగా, ఒకరిని ఇంకొకరికి చానిసలుగా ఆమోదితలుకాకుండా చేయవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. అందుచేత దీనిని పరిశీలించేందుకు ఒక సెలెక్టు కమిటీకి దీనిని వస్తుజేత్యుట భావ్యమని నా అభిప్రాయము.

“ఈ సందర్భంలో ఒక remark నేను చేయదలచుకొన్నాను. ఇక్కడ Treasury Benches లో ఉన్నటువంటి చాలా అనుభవం గలిగినటువంటివారు, బహుశా, ఉపన్యాసములలో వారికంటే మేము చిన్నవార్లుకాము గాని administrative విషయాలలో మేము చిన్నవారేమోనని అనుకొంటాను, ఇటువంటి చిన్న చిన్న విషయాలలో ప్రత్యేకంగా హానికరం గానటువంటి బిల్లులు House కుండు వచ్చి నప్పుడువాటికి సంబంధించినటువంటి Act, amending బిల్లులు చాలా advance గా నె సబ్యులకు పంపడం సబబైన పద్ధతి అనుకొంటాను. ఈ లోపము ఇప్పుడే కాదు. గత సెషనులోకూడా ఇటువంటి లోపాన్ని చూచాను. ఈ లోపాన్ని చాలామంది గౌరవ సభ్యులుకూడా ఇక్కడ చూపించారు కనుక ఈ లోపాన్ని గవర్నమెంటు సభ్యులు గమనించి ఈ విషయాన్ని త్వరగా ఈ సభలో rush చేసి విజ్ సెషన్ బోయిస్తూ సభ్యులయెదుట త్వరత్వరగా వచ్చించి హౌస్ చేయదానికి పూనుకొనుండా విషయాలను పరిశీలించేందుకు తగినటువంటి వ్యవధిని కలుగజేయవలసిన కొరత సెలెక్టు కమిటీ అనుకొంటున్నాను.”

12-50 p.m.

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, the suggestion put forward by the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi and supported by other speakers is that although no Motion was made for referring the Bill to a Select Committee, it should be done, and that not only the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee but, following a certain precedent in the Central Legislature, the original Act also should be gone into by that Select Committee. Now, Sir, apart from the technical question that there is no Motion before the House for the appointment of a Select Committee over this Bill, let us understand the substance of the Bill. It has been brought forward in accordance with the advice given by certain Advisory Committees and by officials having to meet difficulties that have arisen in the execution of the Act. This Bill has been brought to make certain minor amendments in favour of the cane-grower. That the amendments are minor and are in favour of the cane-grower, whether they may be useful or not, has been admitted by all and there is no dispute on that point. The question whether the original Act may now be taken up by the suggested Select Committee is the pith of the suggestion that was made.

“Sir, during the discussion of the Preventive Defention Bill in Parliament, the question was whether the Act should be

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [24th November 1952]

extended, whether it should be given a fresh lease of life. At that time, it was possible for the Prime Minister to accept the suggestion from certain Members that the provisions of the original Act might also be gone into by the Select Committee before extension could be given. The present amendment is, however, different. It is not for extension of the lifetime of the law but for amendment in favour of the cane-grower in respect of certain matters. The amendments introduced are very important, though they are only minor taking the Act as a whole. The Minister who moves the Bill does not ask for extension of the life of the Act. In such a case, it is not possible to entertain the suggestion that we might consider the principle of the old Act itself. Sir, I submit that this is not the time or the place for making such a suggestion nor is it open to us at this stage to consider amendments to the original Act. We can only deal with the present amendments which are very necessary and I would advise Mr. Ramamurthi and his friends to examine the original Act and make any suggestions of an important nature which could be considered by the Government. If he suggests any such improvements to the Act, the Government will give their very earliest consideration."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The question is—

'That the Madras Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.'

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—"There are no amendments before the House. I shall, therefore, put all the clauses of the Bill together to vote."

*SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"అధ్యక్షా, ఇప్పుడు ఈ బిల్లులోని క్లాజులన్నీ ఒకేతరడ వోటుకు పెట్టేదానికంటే clause by clause వోటుకు పెడితే, వాటిపైన మాట్లాడ దలచుకొన్న సభ్యులు మాట్లాడేందుకు అవకాశ ముంటుంది. ఎందుకనగా కొంతమంది ఈ బిల్లును సెలెక్ట్ కమిటీకి refer చేయవలసిందిగా కూడా కోరుతున్నారు. కనుక అటువంటివారు వివిధ క్లాజులపై మాట్లాడేందుకు వీలుగా clause by clause వోటుకు పెట్టవలసిందని కోరుచున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER :—"If the hon. Member wants me to put the clauses one by one, I shall do so."

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 3 was put and carried.

*SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"అధ్యక్షా, ఇది వరకు నేను clause by clause వోటుకు పెట్టుమని కోరడంలో ఆయా క్లాజులపై సభ్యులు మాట్లాడేందుకు అవకాశముంటుందనే ఉద్దేశ్యముతో చెప్పితిని. కాని ఈ క్లాజులు ఒకటి తరువాత ఒకటి వెంట వెంటనే త్వరగా వోటుకు పెట్టుచున్నందువల్ల మాట్లాడదలచినవారు లేచి మాట్లాడేందుకు వీలులేకుండా పోతున్నది. ఒక్కొక్క క్లాజు వోటుకు పెట్టినప్పుడు కొంచెము time ఇస్తే మాట్లాడదలచినవారు మాట్లాడేందుకు వీలుంటుంది. కనుక ఒక్కొక్క క్లాజుకు కొంచెము వ్యవధి ఇస్తే బాగుంటుందని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను."

24th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"He is going from a point of order to a request for time."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"What my Friend has in mind is, if you put the Bill to vote clause by clause, it will give an opportunity to Members to speak on each clause. Apparently, some hon. Members have not yet understood the implications of the procedure now followed. Mr. Venkateswarlu feels that he should say something (laughter) and therefore makes this request. It is now clear that those who want to speak on Clause 4 are at liberty to speak on it, and similarly with regard to Clauses that will follow. (The hon. Member explained the procedure in Telugu.)

"ఎవరికైతే 4 వ క్లాజుమీద మాట్లాడే అభిలాష ఉందో వారికిప్పుడు దానిమీద మాట్లాడే అవకాశమున్నది. అటువంటివారు ఇప్పుడు మాట్లాడవచ్చును. అదే ముస్తరుగానే 5 వ క్లాజును వోటుకు పెట్టినప్పుడు, దానిపైన మాట్లాడదలచినవారు అప్పుడు మాట్లాడవచ్చును."

"Sir, I shall now take the opportunity of making a few comments on Clause 4 of the Bill. I would draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to the wording of the clause which says:

... to crush the sugarcane grown by him for purpose of making gur within the same reserved area or to sell the sugarcane grown by him for that purpose."

I see that some liberty is given to the small grower. It is true and to that extent it will give the cane-grower some relief. Now take the case of a grower who has got his cane ready but the factory in question does not take it. I would have been glad, Sir, if the Government had introduced, together with this new clause, another clause penalising the factory-owner who has not taken the sugarcane offered and driven him to sell otherwise."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The original Act has got it."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I know in the original Act, there is a provision. But the complaint from this side and from those who know something about the subject is that the sections against the grower are enforced and those against the mill-owner are not enforced. In my own district, there have been several instances like this. I do not say that the Government were not able to enforce them because that will be a great reflection upon a mighty Government, but they have not enforced the sections against the factory-owners, although this is a worse comment than the former. Now, as I have said, some opportunity or liberty is given to the grower to dispose of the cane as he likes. But it happened in Bobbili, where there are two mills, that the mills would not purchase the cane offered by the grower and at the same time the grower was not allowed to sell the cane to a factory in Rayagada which offered to take it at a better price. The Act prevented the grower from selling the cane and a good deal of money was lost. Incidentally, the State and the consumer also lost since there was less production of sugar. Therefore, it is a

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [24th November 1952]

matter of policy also and not merely a question of penalising the factory-owner. The grower should be in a position to sell the cane to one owner or the other. The wording of the clause, as it is, enables him to dispose of his cane only for the purpose of manufacturing jaggery. If, on the other hand, the sugarcane is wanted for a better price to be utilized by another mill nearby, why should the grower be prevented from selling it to that mill?

1 p.m. "If the Government want to give real freedom to the grower to dispose of his cane, let them give him the freedom to sell it not for the particular purpose of making jaggery, but to sell it to another mill which might be prepared to pay him more. For instance, the Thumpala Mills in Visakhapatnam district might give the grower only Rs. 1-5-0 whereas the Darlapudi Co-operative Mills nearby might offer him Rs. 1-8-0. Therefore, it will be nice if the Government could give him freedom to dispose of it at the better price to the Mills near at hand."

* SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—"The protection that is sought to be afforded to the tenants . . ."

MR. SPEAKER :—"Let the hon. Member first address the Chair and then proceed."

* SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Bill seeks to afford protection to the growers of cane in areas of less than five acres. So far as my knowledge goes, there seems to be an anomaly here. In the districts of Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam, about 90 per cent of the tenants grow cane in areas less than five acres. If no compulsion is placed on the mill-owners to purchase the cane produced by these small growers, it will be a great hardship to them. The grower has been given freedom only to sell the cane for the purpose of making gur. But if the grower offers the cane to the mill and the mill refuses to take it, what is the remedy? The difficulty cropped up last year when there was a tremendous fall in the price of gur. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, to protect the interest of the grower. There should be an element of compulsion in this Bill. Whether the grower grows the cane in an area of less than five acres or in an area of five or more acres, whenever the cane is offered to the Mills, the Mills should be made to purchase the cane. Only in the case where the grower does not want to offer the cane to the Mills he should have the option to sell away in the open market. It is in that way that protection should be afforded to the grower. But, as the Bill stands, there is no compulsion on the mill-owner to purchase the cane. Therefore, I suggest that the cane-grower, whatever might be the extent of land on which the cane is grown, should first have the option to sell away to the Mill which is in the reserved area. If he is not willing to offer it to the mill for manufacture of sugar, then he should have the option to sell away as he pleases. This is a very necessary thing which the House must take into consideration before passing the Bill into law."

"Then, there is another difficulty as was pointed out by the Leader of Opposition Sri Viswanatham. There are three mills

24th November 1952] [Sri K. V. Ramesam]

in Srikakulam district, at Bobbili, Seethanagaram and Royagada. The area there has been reserved for the cultivation of sugarcane and the growers are restricted to sell cane only to particular mills. When the area is contiguous, it should be open to the grower to sell away the cane to whatever mill he likes. Therefore, that idea also should be borne in mind when we restrict the power of the grower to dispose of his cane."

* SRI CHANDRA RAMALINGIAH :—“అధ్యక్ష, ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము వారు తెచ్చిన యీ Sugar factories కు సంబంధించిన control సవరణ బిల్లులోని నాల్గవ క్లాజు చెరుకు పండించే రైతులకు అనుకూలంగా ఉండుటకును, వారి కష్టాలను తీర్చేటందుకు తెచ్చారు అనటానికి వీలులేదు. ముఖ్యంగా మా కృష్ణా జిల్లాకు సంబంధించినంతవరకు ఒక sugar factory ఉన్నది. ఈ factory యజమానులు యీ రైతులను అనేక యిబ్బందులు పెట్టుతున్నారు. ఈ factory యజమానులు తమకు యిబ్బందువచ్చిన రైతులనుంచి చెరుకుకొని, యిబ్బములేని వాల్లవద్దనుంచి కొనకుండా ఉంటున్నారు. అట్లు చేసినందువల్ల ఆ చెరుకు పడిపోవుటచేకాకుండా రైతులు అనేక నష్టాలకు లోబడుచున్నారు. మా కృష్ణా జిల్లాలో కిందట ఎన్నికలు జరిగినప్పుడు యీ sugar factory యజమాని శ్రీ అడుసుమిల్లి గోపాలకృష్ణయ్యగారు, తమకు ఓట్లు యివ్వలేదనే కార్యక్రమంతో చాలా కాలంనుండి చెరుకువేసున్న రైతులు యీ సంగత్యరంహడా ఘాములు కార్లకు తీసుకొని, దున్ని వరమృతుచేసి చెరుకు నాటుటకు సిద్ధంచేసుకుంటే వార్లకు చెరుకు వేయటానికి permit యివ్వకుండా నష్టపెట్టి తన అనుచరులకు చెరుకు వేసుకోటానికి permits యిచ్చాడు. యీ విషయం వ్యవసాయశాఖ మంత్రిగారి దృష్టికి ముమురందంద్వారా తెచ్చాము. కాని యీ సవరణ బిల్లు తెచ్చేటప్పుడు ఆ ముమురందంలాని విషయాలు దృష్టిలో వుండుకొని ఆ చెరుకు రైతుల కష్టాలు తీరడానికి సవరణలు చేలేదు. ఇట్లా ఇవ్వనందున రైతులు నష్టకడదం జరిగింది. ఈ విషయాలు ప్రభుత్వ దృష్టికి తెచ్చినను ప్రభుత్వమువారు యింతవరకు ఎలాటి చర్య తీసుకొనకపోవడము చాలా హాస్యాస్పదముగా యాననది. ఈ క్లాజును సవరించడంలో, చెరుకు పండించిన రైతులకు యజమానుల చర్యలవల్ల వచ్చిన కష్టనష్టములు తీర్చే విధంగా సవరించితే బాగుంటుందని సలహా యిస్తున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“Sir, the discussion has been more or less on the Act to which this is an amendment. The discussion has been on the principles and provisions of the permanent Act. I am afraid also, if I may be permitted to say so, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has not kept in mind the main provisions of the Act itself to which this is an amendment. According to the original Act, there is reservation and there is registration. Once the cane-grower is registered, he has the right to have his cane bought by the factory to which his cane is attached, so that the mill proprietor has no right to reject the registered cane-grower's cane. Now, the theme of the discussions has been that he should have the right to sell the cane to another mill if he likes. If he wants to do so, he has not to register himself and he takes the chance of his cane being bought or not. The existing provision is compulsory purchase by the factory-owner who has already got the growers registered in his books. That being the basic provision, now we get to an amendment,

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [24th November 1952]

according to the desire of the Advisory Committee and in the interests of the cane-growers, that they should have the liberty if they like—the small growers at least—either not to sell and keep the cane for themselves to make jaggery or to sell it to another person who may make it into jaggery. Therefore, the amendment gives full liberty to the cane-grower without reducing the compulsory character of the obligation of the factory-owner. If the factory-owner's case has to be reconsidered now, we will have to go back to the original Act. So, I submit the House will not unnecessarily take into account possible amendments to the original Act. As I have already explained, there is an obligation on the factory-owner to purchase the cane which belongs to a registered cane-grower. Therefore, there is no difficulty on that account. The only provision that is now newly made is that the small grower can sell his cane, and not only crush the cane himself for the manufacture of jaggery, but he can also sell it to others to make jaggery, which, I think, is an important provision. So, I hope the House will accept the clause as put by the Mover of the Bill."

Clause 4 was then put and carried.

Clause 5.

1-10 p.m.

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“అధ్యక్షా, ఇప్పుడు ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారు మాట్లాడిన reserve areas ను అన్నియును ప్రత్యేకంగా తీసుకోవాలని ఆన్నారు. అట్లాంటప్పుడు చెరుకు ఉన్నంత కాలం బాగానే ఉంటుంది. ఒక్కొక్క sugar factory, దానికి సంబంధించిన area ను ప్రత్యేకంగా తీసుకొనవలసి ఉంటుంది. ఆ విరియాకు సంబంధించిన రైతు చెరుకును తీసుకొనిపోతే, ఆ factory owner ఇష్టపడితే తీసుకొంటాడు, లేకపోతే లేదు. అటువంటప్పుడు ఆ రైతుయొక్క చెరుకుకు ఏ గతి పట్టవలెను. రైతు యితరత్రా అమ్ముకొంటే శిక్షవేస్తామంటారు. Factory owner చూద్దామా చెరుకు కొనడు. అట్లాంటి సమయమున ఆ చెరుకు అటుఇటుకాకుండా మురిపిపోయి చెడిపోవుటకు అరంభమవుతుంది. రైతుకు ఇదంతయు నష్టమేగదా! అట్లుకాకుండా ఏ విరియాలో వుండించిన సరుకు ఆ విరియాలలో ఉన్న రైతులవద్ద కొని తీరవలసిందేనని నిర్బంధ సూత్రము పెట్టినట్లయితే, రైతులకు నష్టముండదు. Factory యజమానులూ నిరాకరించుటకు వీలులేదు. ఈ అయిదవ క్లాజుకు అలాంటి సవరణ తేస్తేనే బాగుంటుందని నా యభిప్రాయము. ఒక్కొక్క factory కి ఒక్కొక్క విరియాను నిర్ణయించితేనే బాగుంటుంది. ఇప్పుడు అట్లా జరగనందున Factory owners కు అభిముఖం ఉంటేనే ఆ సరుకును కొంటున్నారు. లేకపోతే, రైతు నష్టపడడము సంభవిస్తున్నది. ఉదాహరణకు, సాలూరు విరియ. సంగతి చూద్దాము. ఈ విరియా వార్షికోపురిం విరియాకు దగ్గరగా ఉన్నది. సాలూరు ఫాక్టరీ యజమానులు ఆ యెరియాలలో వుండించిన చెరుకు కొనకపోతే, దగ్గరలో ఉన్న వార్షికోపురిం factory కి తీసుకొనిపోయి అమ్ముటకు వీలులేదు. ఇదికాకుండా, మరి యొక విషయము చెప్పుతున్నాను. చెరుకుకు ధర నిర్ణయించేటప్పుడు, స్వకమంగా ఆ ధరకు ఆ రైతువద్ద కొంటే బాగానే ఉంటుంది. అట్లు చేయక ఆ నిశ్చిత ధరకు తగ్గించి అడిగితే ఆ రైతుకు శిక్షింపబడుతాడు. అటువంటప్పుడు ఆ రైతు అటు ఇటుకాకుండా సరుకు చెడిపోతూ నష్టమునకు అమ్ముకోవలసియుంటుంది. ఇదంతయు చూస్తే రైతుకు నష్టము కలుగుతుందేకాని, factory యజమానునికే నష్టములేదు

24th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishniah]

ఇటువంటిప్పుడు ఆ యేరియాలో పండిన సరుకును ఒక వేళ్ళ factory వారు కొనక పోతే ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఆ సరుకు కొనేటందుకు హామీ యివ్వాలని అంటున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వము చాధ్యత తీసుకొంటేనే, ఆ రైతు ధైర్యముగా పండించగలడు. అటువంటి చాధ్యత ప్రభుత్వము వారు తీసుకుంటాగా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. రైతు తెచ్చిన సరుకు factory owners కొనకుండా పడవేసిపెట్టిన కారణంచేత మురిగిపోయినను factory వారు కొనితీరవలెననే నిర్బంధ సూత్రము చాలా అవసరము. ఈ విషయములో యీ అయిదవ క్లాజును సవరించాలని ముఖ్య మంత్రిని కోరుతున్నాను. అందువల్ల యీ యిబ్బందులన్నియు యీ రైతుకు కలుగకుండా యీ అయిదవ క్లాజు సవరించుంటే, ధరల నిర్ణయం విషయంలో ఒక పేచీ, విరియా విషయంలో పేచీ, సరకుకొనే విషయంలో పేచీ, అన్ని విధాలా యీ రైతులను పేచీలతో నష్టపరుస్తున్నారు. ఇన్ని పేచీలు రైతుల విషయంలో పెట్టుతున్నారకాని, factory owner కు ఎలాంటి పేచీ లేకుండా ఉన్నది.

“చిన్న చిన్న రైతుల విషయంలో, అసగా అయిదు ఎకరాలు, అందుకు లోపు ఉన్న రైతులు పండించిన సరుకును ఆ విరియాలో వారికి యిష్టము వచ్చినవారైతే అమ్మకోటానికి అవకాశం ఉందని అంటున్నారు. అట్లా ఎవరు కొనకపోతే, యీ రైతులయొక్క చెరువు అప్పుకము విషయములో ఏమీ జరిగవలెనో ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారిని agriculture శాఖా మంత్రిగారిని దీనికి ఏమీ జూబు చెప్పతారని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—“అధ్యక్ష, అనేక సంవత్సరాలనుండి పేద రైతులకు రక్షణ యివ్వటానికి బదులుగా బడ్డెట్ ప్రాయముగా మత్రమే యీ చట్టములో ఉన్నదని నేనుగట్టిగా చెప్పుచున్నాను. లోగడ Sugar Factory Act ప్రకారం ఫ్యాక్టరీ యజమానులు సడహోక్ రైతులకు చెరుకుడబ్బు చెల్లించక శాసనాన్ని ఉల్లంఘిస్తూవుంటే ఫ్యాక్టరీ యజమానులను శిక్షించటానికి ప్రభుత్వము వెనుకతీస్తున్నది. కాని ఓవైపు అధిక హంద్యంతో కృంగిపోతూ ధరలుపడిపోయి చెరుకుకుతోగినధర ప్రభుత్వము ఇవ్వక చెరుకును యితరత్రా పువయోగించుకుంటే, రైతులను శిక్షించుచున్నారు. లోగడ Defence of India Act ప్రకారం బెల్లంచేసుకున్న రైతులకు తీవ్రశిక్ష విధించారు. అంతేకాని sugar factory owners ఏ విధమైన తప్పుచేసినప్పటికిని, శాసనోల్లంఘనముచేసినప్పటికి వారిమీద వర్తించేసుకోవడంలేదు. కాబట్టి రైతులు తాముపండించుకున్న చెరుకును తమకుతోచిన కద్దతిలో ఉపయోగించుకొనే హక్కునివ్వాలేగాని, యీ విధంగా శిక్షించడము అన్యాయం. ఇది ఒక abnoxious clause కాబట్టి రైతుకు heavy punishment నుయిచ్చే యీ క్లాజును తొలగించకోరుతున్నాను.”

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI :—“అధ్యక్ష, చెరుకు పండించేటటువంటి రైతులు ప్రభుత్వము నిర్ణయించినటువంటి మిల్లియజమానులకు తమ చెరుకును ఖచ్చితంగా అమ్మాలని నిర్ణయించినప్పుడు, ఈ నిర్ణయాన్ని రైతులుగనుక ఉల్లంఘించినట్లయితే 2 వేల రూపాయల జరిమానాగాని లేక 6 నెలల శిక్షగాని విధిస్తారని ఈ క్లాజు చెప్పుతుంది. కాగానే ఉంది! ఇదేమాదిరి ఫ్యాక్టరీ యజమానులు తప్పునిసరిగా, వారికి వచ్చు జెప్పినటువంటి రైతుల చెరుకును కొనవలసినటువంటి నిర్బంధనఉన్నదా, వారు అవిధంగా కొనకుండా నిర్లక్ష్యంచేసినప్పుడు, రైతులకువలెనే ఈ మిల్లి యజమానులకుకూడ తగినటువంటి శిక్ష విధించబడుచున్నదా అని అడుగుచున్నాను. ఎందుకనగా రైతులు కష్టపడి పండించి చెరుకును తీరా ఫ్యాక్టరీలవద్దకు తీసుకొనివెళ్లినప్పుడు, ఆ ఫ్యాక్టరీ

[Sri K. Subba Reddi] [24th November 1952]

యజమానులు దానిని కొనకుండా వదలివేయడమూ, లేక నిర్ణీత ధరలకంటే తక్కువ ధరలకు కొనుటకు ప్రయత్నించడమూ జరుగుతుంది. కనుక మిల్లు యజమానులు రైతులపక్షమండి చెరుకును నిర్ణయించిన ధరలకు తప్పనిసరిగా కొనవలెనంటి నిర్బంధన ఈ బిల్లులో శ్వేచ్ఛిడిందా? వారు ఈ నిర్బంధనను ఉల్లంఘించినట్లయితే వారికి ఇంత శిక్ష అనిగాని జరిమానా అనిగాని ఉన్నదా! అటువంటిదేదీ లేదని నేను అభిప్రాయపడుచున్నాను. కేవలము మిల్లు యజమాన్వకు లాభముకలుగజేసేదిగా వారికి ఒక వకాల్తారూపములో ఏర్పాటుచేయబడినటువంటి పద్ధతిగాయున్నది. నిజంగా రైతుకు రక్షణఇవ్వాలనుకొంటే, ఆతడు పండించేటటువంటిదానిని తన ఇష్టము వచ్చినట్లు ఉమ్మకొనేటటువంటి స్వేచ్ఛావుండాలి. అట్లుగాకపోయినా, కనీసము ఫ్యాక్టరీ యజమానులు తప్పనిసరిగా వారికి నిర్ణయించిన రైతులపక్షమండి చెరుకును నిర్ణీత ధరలకు నిర్బంధంగా కొనేటటువంటి ఆవకాశాన్ని అయినా కల్పించాలి. ఫ్యాక్టరీ యజమానులు ఈ విధంగాచేయక దీనిని ఉల్లంఘించినప్పుడు, ప్రభుత్వము తగినచర్య తీసుకొని రైతులకు రక్షణఇవ్వవలసియుండుంది. అవిధంగా చెన్నైలో తప్ప రైతాంగము చాగుపడదు. కనుక అలాంటి సవరణచేయవలెనని నేనుకోరుచున్నాను.

* THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, this clause is only a consequential Clause. After the House had accepted the previous Clauses, it becomes necessary to amend section 13. Besides the House has also accepted section 11 (a). I therefore suggest that the present Clause may be accepted.”

Clause 5 was put and carried.

Clause 1 and the preamble were then separately put and carried.

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ I now move—

‘ That the Madras Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’ ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That the Madras Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’ ”

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I think that it is the consensus of opinion that we need not have the evening sitting to-day. The House will now adjourn and meet again at 10-30 a.m. to-morrow.”

The House then adjourned to meet again at 10-30 a.m. on Tuesday, 25th November 1952.

V.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

1. G.O. No. 3602, P.W. (Electricity), dated 27th August 1952—Acquisition of Narasaraopet Company Electrical Undertaking—Absorption of staff into Government service.

2. “ New Deal for Tanjore Ryots ”—Pamphlet issued by Information and Publicity Department.

3. Balance-sheet of the Madras Industrial Investment Corporation, Limited, as at 30th June 1952.

24th November 1952]

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 119 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 456 supra.]

G.O. No. 1160, Public (General-B), dated 11th May 1948.

[Service Associations—Recognition by Government—Revised instructions—Issued.]

In supersession of the orders issued in the Government Order read above, the Government of Madras hereby issue revised instructions regarding the recognition of associations of Government employees other than industrial employees. The instructions are annexed to this order and will come into force immediately.

ANNEXURE.

INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING THE RECOGNITION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS OF ASSOCIATIONS OF THEIR EMPLOYEES OTHER THAN ASSOCIATIONS OF INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYEES.

Definition.—In these instructions, “Government” means the Government of Madras.

Part (A)—Associations of Government employees serving in the departments of Government other than those in the Police and Jail departments.—(1) Government are prepared to accord official recognition to associations of their employees which comply with the conditions set out below.

(2) The association must ordinarily consist of a distinct class of Government employees.

(3) Every Government employee of the same class must be eligible for membership of the associations.

(4) Persons who are not in the active service of Government shall not be office-bearers of the association.

(5) Representations from such associations whether made orally, by deputation or presented in writing, may be received by Government officers notwithstanding anything contained in the rules relating to the submission of petitions and memorials by Government servants:

Provided that—

(a) no representations or deputations will be received except in connexion with a matter which is, or raises questions which are, of common interest to the class represented by the association; and

(b) nothing in these instructions affects the discretion of the Governor, the head of a department or any other officer of Government to receive or not to receive a deputation from any association.

(6) Recognition is accorded for the purpose of enabling the employees of Government to communicate their needs and grievances to Government or to Government officers and it may be withdrawn by Government if the members adopt other methods of ventilating those needs and grievances.

NOTE.—For the purpose of this instruction, other methods shall include seditious propaganda, expression of disloyal sentiments, publication in the press, engaging or inviting the assistance of political and other parties for the representation of grievances, and threat of strike.

[24th November 1952]

(7) Government may require the regular submission for their information of copies for the rules of the association and the annual statement of its accounts and of lists of its members.

(8) Government may specify the channel through which representations from the association shall be submitted and authority by whom deputations may be received.

(9) The association shall not seek the assistance of any political party or organization to represent the grievances of its members.

(10) The association shall not, without the previous sanction of the Government, permit its proceedings to be open to the press.

(11) The association shall have the following rule incorporated among its rules:—

“ A strike or the threat of a strike against the Government shall never be used as a means of achieving any of the purposes of the association.”

Part (B)—Associations of employees in the Police and Jail departments.—The instructions in Part (A) shall be applicable to associations of employees in the Police and Jail departments with the following modifications:—

Instruction 2.—To this instruction the following sentence shall be added at the end, namely:—

“ The association shall also consist of such distinct rank or ranks of employees as Government may prescribe, provided that Government may accord recognition to particular associations of specified ranks of employees in the Police department of which specified ranks of employees in the Excise department are also members.”

Instruction 5.—For proviso (a) to this instruction, the following proviso shall be substituted, namely:—

“ (a) No representation or deputation will be received on questions of discipline or of promotion affecting individuals; but representations or deputations may be received in connexion with any other matter which is, or raises questions which are, of common interest to the class represented by the association.”

Instruction 7.—To this instruction, the following sentence shall be added at the end, namely:—

“ No rule of the association shall be valid until it has received the approval of Government and Government may from time to time require the modification of a rule or proposed rule in a particular manner.”

* APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 18 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 465 supra.]

Investigation of hydro-electric sites in the State of Madras.

A systematic and scientific study of all water basins in the State is being made by the Government Electricity Department from maps and available records and possible hydro-electric

24th November 1952]

schemes are noted down for their hydro-electric values. The hydro-dynamic value of a basin so worked out from maps and available records will have to be checked with actual rainfall and run off observations over a number of years, say about 20 years. This is expected to cost about Rs. 25 lakhs. A programme spread over a period of 10 years is contemplated. The first Five-year Programme will cover the most important river basins, the development of which will be more promising. An estimate for Rs. 12.5 lakhs for the first part of the above programme of hydro-metric surveys covering a period of 5 years has since been sanctioned by the Government. From a study of hydro-metric observations so obtained, basins likely to yield the best and most economical hydro-electric schemes are chosen for detailed investigation. Only after the detailed investigations are completed, project reports are prepared and sent up to Government for sanction.

2. Out of the four rivers mentioned in clause (a) of the question, Gundlakamma is included in the second Five-year Programme of hydro-metric surveys while in respect of the other three, viz., Manneru, Kalangi and Swarnamukhi, preliminary study has indicated that the hydro-electric possibilities are poor. The quantities of water available in these rivers are not appreciable. Except Kundah river which is a tributary of Bhayani (item No. 2 on page 18 of the Administration Report for 1949-50), none of the other schemes have been investigated.

APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 20 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 466 supra.]

Statement I.

Distribution of free milk during 1951-52.

Serial number.	Name of place.	Number of Maternity and Child-Welfare Centres.	Milk supplied to		
			Expectant mothers.	Nursing mothers.	Children.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
DISTRICTS.					
1	Tiruchirappalli	11	9 (both i.e., expectant and nursing mothers).	..	71
2	Anantapur	3	4	4	70
3	Ramanathapuram	1	..	..	15
	Total ..	15	13	4	156

[24th November 1952]

Serial number.	Name of place.	Number of Maternity and Child Welfare Centres.	Milk supplied to		
			Expectant mothers.	Nursing mothers.	Children.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MUNICIPALITIES.					
1	Kumbakonam	2	..	..	60
2	Kancheepuram	3	..	..	120
3	Chittoor	..	8 (both)	..	252
4	Ootacamund	2	4	..	58
5	Gudivada	1	..	..	20
6	Udamalpet	1	16	28	28
7	Tuticorin	4	..	..	120
8	Villupuram	1 (plus) 1 (home)	12	5	30
9	Hindupur	1	9	5	50
10	Palni	1	63 (both)	..	100
11	Rajahmundry	1	..	..	30
12	Coonoor	1 (creche)	..	..	20
13	Tanjore	3	12 (both)	..	10
14	Vellore	2	..	..	136
15	Kozhikode	4	100	100	60
16	Tiruvarur	2	..	..	30
17	Rajapalayam	5	..	..	300
18	Palacole	1	14 (both)	..	244
19	Tiruppur	..	..	..	..
20	Tirunelveli	6	..	..	25
21	Cannanore	2	..	..	1
22	Nellore	1	4	..	42
23	Palayamkottai	2	81 (both)	..	92
24	Cuddapah	1	9	6	56
25	Dindigul	3	8	20	192
26	Chidambaram	..	..	13	..
27	Tellicherry	2	80 (both)	..	130
28	Palghat	1	..	..	19
29	Chingleput	1	..	..	20
30	Periyakulam	1	9	60	80
31	Vizianagaram	..	..	..	550 (in all)
32	Masulipatnam	3	..	..	87
33	Kakinada	2	..	..	59
34	Tiruchirappalli	2	..	..	70
35	Karur	1	..	..	80
36	Aruppukkottai	1	8	8	34
37	Gobichettipalayam	1	..	..	32
38	Tindivanam	2	..	..	100
39	Anantapur	2	3	9	40
Total ..		70	440	254	3,377
Grand total ..		85	453	258	3,533

24th November 1952]

Statement II.

[Vide answer to clause (b) of the question.]

Number of maternity and child-welfare centres in famished areas of the State.

<i>Serial number.</i>	<i>Name of the district.</i>	<i>As on 1st April 1952.</i>	<i>As on 1st September 1952.</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	Salem	22	22
2	Anantapur.. .. .	8	8
3	Kurnool	4	4
4	Bellary	5	5
5	Coimbatore	13	14
6	Chittoor	21	22
7	North Arcot	13	13
8	Cuddapah	7	7
		93	95

APPENDIX IV.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 21 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 467 supra.]

Thermal Station at Nellore.

(a) 2nd October 1950.

(b) About 30,000 units per day.

(c) Average number of units per day supplied to all consumers—5,300.

Average number of units per day supplied to agricultural consumers—20.

(d) I. Rates charged for consumers for lights in Nellore town and Kovur Panchayats areas—

For all lighting and fan purposes the rates are as under subject to a monthly minimum of Rs. 1-8-0 per single phase and Rs. 5 for three-phase services :—

	<i>Per unit.</i>
	<i>AS.</i>
For the first 100 units consumed per mensem.	6
For the rest up to 2,000 units per mensem ..	4
For all above 2,000 units per mensem ..	3

A war costs surcharge of 40 per cent is levied on the above rates.

[24th November 1952]

II. Rate charged for consumers for lights in Gudur town—

	Per unit.
	AS.
(1) Lighting	5
(2) Combined installations of lights and not less than 80 watts in permanently connected ceiling fans utilized per service.	4

Minimum Rs. 2 per month per service.

The above rate is subject to a war costs surcharge of 20 per cent.

APPENDIX V.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 22 asked by Sri D. Krishnamurty Gounder at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 467 supra.]

Statement showing the monthly pay, etc., drawn by each of the Ministers.

Name and designation.	Pay.	Conve- yance allow- ance.	House-rent allowance (where free quarters have not been provided).
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	RS.	RS.	RS.
1 Sri C. Rajagopalachari, Chief Minister.	1,000	250	250
2 Sri S. B. P. Patabhi Rama Rao, Minister for Rural Welfare.	1,000	250	250
3 Raja Sri Sharmugha Rajeswara Sethu- pathi, Minister for Accommodation and Sports.	1,000	250	250
4 Sri N. Sankara Reddi, Minister for Local Administration.	1,000	250	250
5 Sri K. Venkataswami Naidu, Minister for Religious Endowments and Registration.	1,000	250	250
6 Sri D. Sanjivayya, Minister for Co-operation.	1,000	250	250
7 Sri C. Subramaniam, Minister for Finance and Food.	1,000	250	250
8 Dr. U. Krishna Rao, Minister for Industries and Labour.	1,000	250	250
9 Sri A. B. Shetty, Minister for Health.	1,000	250	Provided with free quarters.
10 Sri N. Ranga Reddi, Minister for Public Works.	1,000	250	Do.
11 Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker, Minister for Land Revenue.	1,000	250	Do.
12 Sri V. C. Palaniswami Gounder, Minister for Prohibition.	1,000	250	Do.
13 Sri R. Nagan Gouda, Minister for Agriculture.	1,000	250	Do.
14 Dr. M. V. Krishna Rao, Minister for Education.	1,000	250	Do.
15 Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nair, Minister for Law.	1,000	250	Do.

24th November 1952]

APPENDIX VI.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 23 asked by Sri G. Latchanna at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 467 supra.]

Particulars of estates taken over under Act XXVI of 1948.

<i>District.</i>	<i>Date on which taken over.</i>	<i>Zamin estates.</i>	<i>Under-tenure estates.</i>	<i>Inam estates.</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Srikakulam	7th September 1949	28	..	..
	7th September 1950	1	..	..
	12th January 1951	137	6	..
	20th January 1951	..	38	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	90
	22nd January 1951	..	..	30
	6th May 1952	1	1	..
	21st May 1952	..	1	..
	2nd July 1952	..	..	34
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders	6	..	2
		173	46	156
Visakhapatnam	7th September 1949	3	..	..
	7th September 1950	2	..	..
	12th January 1951	30	..	..
	20th January 1951	..	36	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	26
	22nd November 1951	..	..	2
	2nd July 1952	..	..	21
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders	1	..	..
		36	36	49
East Godavari	7th September 1949	8	..	..
	7th September 1950	72	..	..
	3rd January 1951	1	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	7
	2nd July 1952	..	..	11
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders	6	..	..
		87	..	18

[24th November 1952]

<i>District.</i>	<i>Date on which taken over.</i>	<i>Zamin estates.</i>	<i>Under-tenure estates.</i>	<i>Inam estates.</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
West Godavari	7th September 1949	7	3	..
	7th September 1950	119	48	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	57
	2nd July 1952	..	..	10
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders	5	2	..
		<u>131</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>67</u>
Krishna	7th September 1949	18	5	..
	7th September 1950	105	45	..
	3rd January 1951	2	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	51
	2nd July 1952	..	..	8
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders	11	11	..
		<u>136</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>59</u>
Guntur	3rd January 1951	..	14	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	27
	2nd July 1952	..	..	3
		..	<u>14</u>	<u>30</u>
Nellore	7th September 1949	1	179	..
	7th September 1950	70	54	..
	3rd January 1951	..	11	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	143
	2nd July 1952	..	..	8
	Since taken over	..	13	..
		<u>71</u>	<u>257</u>	<u>151</u>
Chittoor	7th September 1949	6	..	..
	7th September 1950	204	42	..
	3rd January 1951	34	2	..
	1st July 1951	..	1	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	181
	3rd October 1951	2	..	..
	2nd July 1952	..	..	12
	16th July 1952	..	26	..
	Since taken over	11	..	..
		<u>257</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>193</u>
Bellary	1st October 1951	..	..	60

24th November 1952]

District.	Date on which taken over.		Zamin estates.	Under-tenure estates.	Inam estates.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Kurnool	1st October 1951		..	..	52
Cuddapah	1st October 1951		..	..	120
	2nd July 1952		..	..	2
			..	..	122
Anantapur	1st October 1951		..	..	77
	2nd July 1952		..	..	2
			..	..	79
Madras	3rd January 1951		5	..	..
	1st October 1951		..	..	2
			5	..	2
Chingleput	3rd January 1951		268	..	..
	1st October 1951		..	..	202
	22nd November 1951		..	..	1
	11th March 1952		..	22	..
	2nd July 1952		..	..	1
	Since taken over		64	..	10
			332	22	214
North Arcot	3rd January 1951		56	45	..
	1st October 1951		..	..	35
	20th February 1952		..	4	..
	Since taken over		7	..	..
			63	49	35
South Arcot	3rd January 1951		4	..	..
	1st October 1951		..	..	39
			4	..	39
Salem	12th January 1951		275	96	..
	31st January 1951		..	28	..
	1st October 1951		..	..	18
	22nd November 1951		..	..	30
	30th January 1952		..	5	..
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders		4	..	..
			279	124	48

[24th November 1952]

<i>District.</i>	<i>Date on which taken over.</i>	<i>Zamin estates.</i>	<i>Under-tenure estates.</i>	<i>Inam estates.</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madurai	3rd January 1951	20	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	185
	2nd July 1952	..	..	2
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders ..	3	..	..
		<u>23</u>	<u>..</u>	<u>187</u>
Ramanathapuram ..	7th September 1949	10	736	..
	7th September 1950	22	..	..
	3rd January 1951	5	59	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	1,098
	22nd November 1951	..	..	8
	2nd July 1952	..	..	92
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders ..	..	2	25
		<u>37</u>	<u>797</u>	<u>1,223</u>
Tirunelveli	3rd January 1951	62	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	62
	22nd November 1951	..	..	19
	2nd July 1952	..	..	9
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders	3	..	..
		<u>65</u>	<u>..</u>	<u>90</u>
Coimbatore	3rd January 1951	7	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	9
		<u>7</u>	<u>..</u>	<u>9</u>
Tiruchirappalli	3rd January 1951	52	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	84
		<u>52</u>	<u>..</u>	<u>84</u>
Tanjore	3rd January 1951	93	9	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	390
	22nd November 1951	..	..	1
	2nd July 1952	..	..	22
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders	1	..	9
		<u>94</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>422</u>
Grand total		<u>1,852</u>	<u>1,539</u>	<u>3,389</u>

24th November 1952]

APPENDIX VII.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 24 asked by Sri G. Latothanna at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 468 supra.]

Statement showing the names of villages which are affected by virtue of recent judicial decisions.

1. *By not being grant of whole inam village—*

- | | |
|---|--|
| (1) Rajannapeta (Visakhapatnam). | (7) Malliboyanapalli (Krishna). |
| (2) Kucalametta Lakshmapuram (Visakhapatnam). | (8) Gopalapatnam (Visakhapatnam). |
| (3) Arakkottai (Ramanathapuram). | (9) Kallivayal (Ramanathapuram). |
| (4) Athankottangudi (Ramanathapuram). | (10) Malkapuram (Guntur). |
| (5) Janardhana Rangarayapuram (Srikulam). | (11) Parisaivaleduthan (Ramanathapuram). |
| (6) Melasendanandal (Ramanathapuram). | (12) Chinnayerukapadu (Krishna). |

2. *By being a grant of only a hamlet or kandriga—*

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| (13) Siruvilathiendal (Ramanathapuram). | (15) Idulaguntapalem (West Godavari). |
| (14) Kothandaramapuram (Nellore). | |

3. *By reason of more grants than one—*

- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| (16) Soodiyur (Ramanathapuram). | (17) Perunthurai (Ramanathapuram). |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|

4. *By reason of being carved out of an original village—*

- | |
|---------------------------|
| (18) Ulavapala (Nellore). |
|---------------------------|

APPENDIX VIII.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 32 asked by Sri P. Rangasami Reddiar at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 471 supra.]

Statement showing the list of new permits granted for stage carriages in Tiruchirappalli district for the period 1947—52.

Route.	To whom granted.	Number of permits.
(1)	(2)	(3)
1947.		
No new permits were issued during the year.		
1948.		
Tiruchirappalli to Tanjore	Sri R. Krishnaswami Reddiar.	4
.. ..	Sri Chidambara Reddiar ..	2
Tiruchirappalli to Thuraiyur	Sri R. Krishnaswami Reddiar.	2
1949.		
Ariyalur to Thirumanur	P. R. Srinivasa Reddiar ..	1
Ariyalur to Lubbaikudikedu via Perambalur.	A. Somasundara Reddiar ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Perambalur	National Motor Service ..	2
Tiruchirappalli to Erakudi via Thuraiyur ..	Charity Aids Bus Service ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Mettupalayam via Musiri ..	Sadaya Pillai ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Pandamangalam via Kattuputhur.	Mesars. Charity Aids ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Mohanur via Namakkal ..	B. S. Guruswami Pillai ..	1

[24th November 1952]

Route. (1)	To whom granted. (2)	Number of permits. (3)
1949—cont.		
Thuraiyur to Thammampatty	R. Krishnaswami Reddiar ..	1
Perambalur to Namakkal via Thuraiyur	S. Natesa Udayar	1
Pallapatti to Thavuttupalayam via Karur	Karur Trichy Transports, Karur.	1
Karur to Dharapuram	P. Manickavasagam	1
Karur to Pallapatti via Dindigul	Star Transports	1
Karur to Palani	Do.	1
Erode to Pallapatti via Vellakoil	S. Natesan, Koodalur	1
Ariyalur to Musiri via Perambalur and Thuraiyur.	J. G. Dorairaj, Musiri	1
Perambalur to Attur	S. Natesa Udayar	1
Perambalur to Kattuputhur via Thuraiyur and Musiri.	P. R. Srinivasa Reddiar	1
Tiruchirappalli to Chettikulam	A. Somasundara Reddiar	1
Thuraiyur to Mohanur via Musiri	R. Krishnaswami Reddiar	1
Mettupalayam to Ariyalur	S. M. Sadaya Pillai	1
Tiruchirappalli to Musiri	J. G. Dorairaj, Musiri	1
Karur to Vallakoil	S. Natesan	1
Karur to Paramathi	P. Manickavasagam	1
Tiruvanaikoil to Tiruchirappalli Junction via guard Gate and Palakkarai.	Nadar Transports M. S. N. Shanmugam Pillai.	2 1
Mainguard Gate to Court via Tenna	A. S. M. Kandaswamy Southern Roadways	1 1
Mainguard Gate to Court via Woraipur	A. S. M. Kandaswamy	2
Mainguard Gate to Crawford Colony via Route.	M. S. N. Sivashanmugam Pillai.	2
Mainguard to Jail corner via Roundtana.	Southern Roadways	2
Tiruchirappalli to Tanjore	B. S. Guruswami Pillai	1
Tiruchirappalli to Samayapuram	Charity Aids	1
Perambalur to Arumbavoor	A. Somasundaram Reddiar	1
Mainguard Gate to Somarasampettai	Nadar Transport	1
1950.		
Tiruchirappalli to Perambalur	Charity Aids	1
Tiruchirappalli to Mohanur via Namakkal	B. S. Guruswami Pillai	1
Perambalur to Namakkal via Thuraiyur	Natesa Udayar	1
Tiruchirappalli to Pandamangalam via Kattuputhur.	Charity Aids	1
Ariyalur to Lubbaikudikadu via Perambalur to Tirumandurai.	P. S. Srinivasa Reddiar	1
Pudukkottai to Pattukkottai via Alangudi, Melaiyur and Thiruvonam.	A. S. S. Y. S. Nachiappa Chettiar. R. Natesan Pillai.	1
Karur to Paramathi	P. Manickavasagam	1
Ariyalur to Musiri via Perambalur and Thuraiyur.	J. G. Dorairaj	1
Tiruchirappalli to Thirumalavadi via Lalgudi and Pallambadi.	V. Krishnaswami Reddiar	1
Tiruchirappalli to Perambalur	Charity Aids	1
Tiruchirappalli to Pandamangalam via Kattuputhur and Melur.	S. M. Sadaya Pillai	1
Ariyalur to Labbaikudikadu via Perambalur	R. Rama Reddiar	1

24th November 1952]

Route.	To whom granted.	Number of permits.
(1)	(2)	(3)
1950—cont.		
Tiruchirappalli to Samayapuram	National Motor Service ..	1
	R. Venugopala Reddiar ..	1
Ariyalur to Lower Anaicut via Jayakondam	P. Natesa Chettiar	1
Tiruchirappalli to Chettikulam	M. Krishnaswami Reddiar ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Musiri	S. M. Sadaya Pillai	1
Perambalur to Arumbavoor	T. N. Mooka Pillai	1
Musiri to Kattuputhur	R. Venugopal Reddiar ..	1
Ariyalur to Lower Anaicut via Jayakondam	S. Natesa Udayar	1
Tiruchirappalli to Labbaikudikadu via Perambalur and Tirumandurai.	V. Muthunallappa Reddiar, Tiruchirappalli.	1
Tiruchirappalli Junction to Tiruvansikoil via Palakarai and Mainguard Gate.	Messrs. Nadar Transports ..	3
Tiruchirappalli Mainguard Gate to Court via Woraiyur.	Messrs. T.S.T. Co.	3
Tiruchirappalli Mainguard Gate to Court via Tennur.	Messrs. T.S.T. Co.	1
	M. S. N. Shanmugam Pillai.	1
Tiruchirappalli Mainguard Gate to Tiruverambur, via Butterworth road and Eastern Boulevard road.	Southern Roadways	2
Tiruchirappalli Mainguard Gate to Somarasampettai via Tennur.	Nadar Transport	2
Tiruchirappalli Mainguard Gate to Mannachanallur	Southern Roadways	1
Tiruchirappalli Junction to Mannachanallur ..	Southern Roadways	1
1951.		
Karur to Chinnadarapuram	Star Transports	1
Pudukkottai to Oliyamangalam	M. Palaniyandi Velar	1
Vendampatti to Karambakudi	S. Muthuswami Naidu	1
Karur to Oddanchatram	Manickavasagam	1
Tiruchirappalli to Chettikulam via Samayapuram.	V. Krishnaswami Reddiar ..	1
Pudukkottai to Karambukudi via Melayur ..	Srimathi V. Alamelu Ammal.	1
Pudukkottai to Marambukudi via Vattam Viduthu.	L. Narayanan	1
Tiruchirappalli to Attur via Perambalur and Krishnapuram.	R. Rama Reddiar	1
	A. Doraiswami Reddiar ..	1
Jayakondam to Lower Anaicut	M. S. Ganesan and R. Krishnaswami.	1
Pudukkottai to Mangadu via Vadakkadi.	Alangudi and T. A. S. Thangavelu ..	1
1952.		
Tiruchirappalli Junction to Sembattur	Southern Roadways	2
Karur to Thavuttupalayam	Messrs. Star Transports ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Samayapuram	R. Chinnaiah Naidu	1
Perambalur to Thuraiyur	Messrs. National Motor Service.	1
Musiri to Mettupalayam	J. G. Dorairaj	1
Mettupalayam to Thuraiyur	S. M. Sadaya Pillai	1
Sendurai to Madanathur via Jayakondam ..	Srimathi Periammal	1
Tiruchirappalli to Thiruvellarai	Tiruchi Co-operative Motor Transport Society for Ex-Service men.	1

